

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 016

SE 023 905

AUTHOR Crockett, Walter H.; And Others
 TITLE Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-67 (with Appendixes).
 INSTITUTION Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs.
 SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 67
 NOTE 113p.; For related document, see SE 023 906

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$6.01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; Higher Education; Inservice Education; *Inservice Teacher Education;
 *Professional Associations; Science Education;
 *Teacher Education; Teacher Workshops; *Workshops
 IDENTIFIERS National Science Foundation; Research Reports

ABSTRACT

Reported is a study conducted by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (COMPASS) to assess the effectiveness and impact of institutes and other special teacher-training programs, to propose means of improving such programs, and to provide a medium for dialogue among professional associations. Results indicate programs are received overwhelmingly favorable, level of solidarity and morale among participants correlated positively with effectiveness, work assignments are heavy and inversely related to effectiveness, and the program director is extremely important to the effectiveness of individual programs. (SL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED150016

Report on
THE EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, 1966-67
(with Appendixes)

By

Walter H. Crockett
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Joseph C. Bentley
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

and

James D. Laird
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Consortium of Professional Associations
For the Study of
Special Teacher Improvement Programs

1967

SE 023 905

Preface

This report is based on a study conducted by the Consortium of Professional Associations for the Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs (CONPASS) for the U.S. Office of Education.

The Consortium was formed in May, 1966, by the American Historical Association, the Association of American Geographers, the Department of Audiovisual Instruction (NEA), the International Reading Association, and the Modern Language Association of America. Invitations were later extended to, and accepted by, the American Economic Association, the American Industrial Arts Association, and the American Political Science Association. Four members at large provide liaison with the arts and humanities, psychological tests and measurement, educational psychology, and teacher education specialists.

The objectives of CONPASS are to provide a coordinated assessment of the effectiveness and impacts of institutes and other special teacher-training programs; to propose means of improving such programs; and to provide a medium for dialogue among the professional associations and leading scholars of the several subject content disciplines and fields represented on its Board. In the past, the Consortium has conducted studies of summer institutes in individual disciplines; it is presently sponsoring an extensive study of the impact of summer institutes in four disciplines upon participants in the institutes.

The present report is on Phase One of the study of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. The study was contracted by CONPASS to Clark University, to be conducted under the supervision of the Consortium Board. The research was initiated by Professors Crockett and Bentley, Professor Laird participated in the analysis of the results and in the writing of the report. The research staff spent four days in a writing conference in July, 1967, with Drs. John Thompson, Saul Cohen, William Engbretson, Richard Longaker, and Mr. John Cogan; at this conference, the results were studied in detail and the outline of the present report was formulated. Preliminary drafts of the report were examined by the members of the writing conference and by the Executive Committee of the Consortium; the final version of the report has benefitted extensively from their comments.

An advanced edition, without appendixes, was published in October, 1967.

Contents

Preface	i
Contents	ii
Index of Tables	iii
I. Introduction	1
Development of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program	1
Evaluation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program	2
II. An Overview of the Results	5
III. The Population and the Programs	9
Characteristics of the Participants	9
Characteristics of the Faculty	12
Characteristics of the Programs	13
IV. A Profile of Reactions to the Program	15
Satisfaction and Effectiveness	15
Structural Aspects of the Programs	20
Operating Strategies	22
General Summary of Impressions of the Program	29
V. Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction	30
The Role of the Director in Program Effectiveness	30
Some Comments on Correlational Methods	31
Correlations Among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction	32
The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Structure	34
The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Strategy	37
Summary: Correlates of Effectiveness	43

Index of Tables

1. Comparisons of Fellows with Typical Graduate Students Made by Faculty and Program Directors	11
2. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of How Stimulating and Interesting They Found the Program	16
3. Comparisons by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of ExTFP and Other Institutes	17
4. Estimates by Faculty, Directors, Fellows, and Evaluators of Whether the Program Met Fellows' Needs	18
5. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of Group Solidarity and Morale	20
6. Judgments of Whether Programs Built Upon Fellows' Experience and Preparation	23
7. Ratings by Faculty and Directors of Whether the Program was Challenging and Satisfying	25
8. Judgments by Faculty and Directors of the Program's Effects on Their Own Development	26
9. Judgments by Faculty, Directors and Evaluators of the Program's Effects upon Institutional Development	28
10. Correlations among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction	33
11. Correlations among Measures of Solidarity and Morale	34
12. Correlations of Solidarity and Morale with Program Effectiveness	35
13. Correlations among Measures of Departmental and Institutional Cooperation	36
14. Correlations of Departmental Cooperation with Program Effectiveness	36
15. Correlations among Measures of Whether the Programs Utilized Fellows' Backgrounds	37
16. Correlations of Utilization of Participants' Backgrounds with Program Effectiveness	38

Index of Tables (Continued)

17. Correlations among Measures of Competitiveness and Work Load	39
18. Correlations of Competitiveness and Work Load with Program Effectiveness	39
19. Correlations among Measures of Faculty Involvement	40
20. Correlations of Faculty Involvement with Program Effectiveness	41
21. Correlations of Innovativeness with Program Effectiveness	42
22. Correlations among Measures of Effects on Institutional Development	42
23. Correlations of Effects on Institutional Development with Program Effectiveness	43

Appendixes

A. Experimental Teacher Fellowship Programs, 1966-67	47
B. Responses to Participant Questionnaire	51
C. Responses to Faculty Questionnaire	63
D. Responses to Directors Questionnaire	77
E. Experienced Teacher Fellowship Evaluation Teams	93
F. Responses to Visitors Evaluation Form	101

I. Introduction

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is a unique and imaginative venture. Its ultimate objective, and that of two other, closely related programs, is to improve the quality of education in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. The three programs pursue this objective in two ways: by assisting selected, potentially influential teachers to pursue full-time graduate education in specially planned courses of study, and by fostering and strengthening an increased concern for the training of teachers. The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program sponsors special programs that provide financial support for graduate studies to teachers with field experience. A second program, the Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program, supports similar kinds of programs for individuals who have no teaching experience but who expect to become elementary or secondary school teachers. The third program, the Institutional Assistance Grant Program, awards financial grants to strengthen the graduate programs for teacher preparation in institutions that have already been awarded either an Experienced or a Prospective Teacher Fellowship Program. The present report summarizes a preliminary study of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

A. The Development of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

The history of the ExTFP belies the generalization that governmental programs develop slowly. It was authorized under Title V, Part C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Guidelines for the program were distributed in two letters, dated December 27, 1965, and January 10, 1966. The deadline for mailing completed proposals was January 20. During the period January 24-26 a panel of consultants evaluated the proposals, and the announcement of awards was made in February. This was barely two months after the first guideline was sent out. The first students began their study in June, 1966.

Despite the speed with which the program was mounted, almost 1,000 proposals were submitted for the academic year 1966-67. Fifty of these proposals were funded, enabling just over a thousand experienced teachers, from all parts of the country and representing diverse disciplines, to spend a year (in a few programs, two years) in full-time graduate study.

In its underlying assumptions, the conception of the ExTFP was broad and inclusive. In the guidelines, no limits were suggested as to the range of subject matter that would be supported; no premium was placed on either innovation or traditionalism in educational procedures, and there was no attempt to specify in detail the structure that the graduate programs should adopt. There was, however, the assumption that graduate education is most effective when the courses a student takes are related to one another in a meaningful fashion. The guidelines for ExTFP proposals incorporated this assumption by setting three restrictions on authors of proposals:

First, evidence was required of more than perfunctory cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education specialists. All proposals were required to demonstrate that a suitable faculty could be arranged for, composed of members of "teacher education" and

"non-teacher education" departments. Further, both the chairman or dean for the substantive aspect of the program and the chairman or dean for teacher education were required to sign the proposal before it was submitted.

Second, institutions were required to adopt an en bloc procedure, by designing a program for the entire group of fifteen to thirty fellows, rather than leaving the individual fellows "to the mercy of the catalogue's cafeteria-like offerings, so often unsuited to the needs of experienced personnel." The en bloc mode of organization was also to provide greater visibility of the program on the campus as well as increased opportunity for fellows to profit from interaction with their peers and from formal instruction by their professors.

Third, the guidelines encouraged cooperation between the institution of higher education and the local school district or system. This was fostered in part by the requirement that fellows be selected jointly by their home educational system and by the college or university concerned. School administrators were required to recommend applicants, and applicants were expected to return to the school systems from which they came. In addition, in order to confront the realities of teaching in schools, cooperation was encouraged between colleges and local school systems, to provide a meaningful practicum experience for the participants.

The fifty programs that were funded were held in forty-seven different colleges and universities. Programs were conducted in 17 different disciplines, ranging from general fields of education (elementary education, teaching the disadvantaged, and counseling and guidance) through the traditional liberal arts disciplines, and including specialized areas such as health education, the school library, and educational media. The fellows were drawn from every part of the country and from schools which served every economic level. Their educational assignments ranged from preschool to high school. A listing of programs is presented in Appendix A.

B. Evaluation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

1. Three Projected Evaluation Studies

Just as the ExTFP was planned and instituted with considerable speed, so, also, were the procedures for studying the program's effectiveness. Barely three months elapsed between the formation of a research team and completion of data collection for the present report. During that time, a plan has taken form which foresees a series of three related investigations of the effectiveness of the ExTFP: a questionnaire study of responses to the first year's program; during the second year, a field investigation of the operation of the ExTFP in three different institutions; and, in the third year, another study of the entire set of institutions then involved in the ExTFP. Each successive investigation will build on the results obtained by those preceding.

The first of these studies, based on questionnaires and visits by teams to selected programs, will be described at length below. The intensive pilot study of three individual programs will be carried out during the academic year 1967-68; it will involve repeated interviews with participants and faculty in each institution and the periodic administration

of questionnaires and other tests. The extensive body of information that will be obtained will permit an acquaintance in depth with the operation of these three institutions, making it possible to identify factors that appear to account for the effects the programs have upon the fellows, the faculty, and the institution. An important aspect of this second study will be interviews with the fellows after they have returned to their home schools in 1968-69. The third investigation, to be initiated during the academic year 1968-69, will be an extensive study of all the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs then in operation, using self-report measures, interviews, and observations, all developed out of earlier research experiences.

2. The Procedures Used in the Present Investigation

The present report rests upon two kinds of data: responses to questionnaires that were administered to the individuals who were actually involved in the program, and reports by teams of evaluators who visited 31 of the 50 programs.

Four questionnaires were constructed for administration to those involved in the programs. Each questionnaire borrowed heavily from those used in earlier studies of summer institutes. One questionnaire, containing some 60 different items, was administered to the fellows at the institutions they attended, under conditions which assured anonymity. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 940 of the 1,004 fellows, representing 49 of the 50 institutions.¹ This questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.

The director at each institution was asked to supply the names of the full-time and part-time staff of his program. A copy of a second questionnaire, about equal in length to the student questionnaire, was then mailed to every full-time faculty member and to five randomly-selected part-time faculty members on each campus. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 187 faculty members, in 47 different institutions. This questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix C.

A third questionnaire, sent to the director at each institution, was identical to the faculty questionnaire except that it contained an additional set of ten items concerning the administration of the program. Of the 50 directors, 45 returned these questionnaires in time for analysis in the present report. This questionnaire is presented in Appendix D.

The fourth questionnaire, intended to assess the impact of the program upon the existing teacher-education procedures at the institutions, was sent to the director of teacher education on each campus. Response to this questionnaire was spotty; for this reason, these replies will not be discussed in detail in this report.

¹Questionnaires were not received from the program in Social Studies at the University of Minnesota.

The evaluation teams, which visited 31 of the 50 programs, normally consisted of three persons: a specialist in the subject matter of the institute, a specialist in teacher education, and a teacher experienced in the relevant subject matter.¹ Some 85 members of these evaluation teams met in early April with the research team, members of CONPASS, and representatives from the Office of Education for a discussion of the evaluation rating scale and of the procedure that was to be followed in the evaluation visit. They then spent two days on the campuses to which they were assigned, meeting with faculty, students, and administrators, visiting classes, and reviewing the general operation of the programs. Subsequently, each team member individually completed a Visitors Evaluation Form, containing 24 different items. For each item, the evaluator rated the program on a 7-point scale, and then was asked to provide a written analysis of that aspect of the program's operation in explanation of his rating. In addition to the individual reports, the team members submitted a combined evaluation on each item of the evaluation form; this last report represented the consensus of all the team members. A list of evaluation teams and the institutions they visited is presented in Appendix E; Appendix F presents the Visitors Evaluation Form.

¹Because of difficulties in scheduling members of evaluation teams, three institutions were visited by teams of only two members; at two institutions, the team contained four members.

II. An Overview of the Results

In the following chapters a detailed report will be made of the results of this study. The purpose of the present chapter is to point out the highlights of these results.

For the most part, the fellows who took part in the program were relatively young teachers. Their ability and motivation were apparently very high. According to program directors and faculty members, the fellows were at least equal, if not superior, to regular graduate students in motivation and quality of work. The educational attainments and experience of faculty members also suggest that teachers in the program were well qualified. Thus, the great majority of the fifty programs possessed the two principal qualifications for an effective academic program: an able, highly motivated student body and a capable, concerned faculty.

The general correlates of effectiveness and the extent to which the Program's potential effectiveness was realized are summarized in the following generalizations. The specific results on which the generalizations are based are contained in subsequent sections of the report.

1. The reaction to the Program by program directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluation teams was overwhelmingly favorable.

As a general rule, the extent of a source's enthusiasm about the Program varied with that source's degree of professional investment in it: directors' responses were usually more favorable than those by faculty members, faculty members were more favorable than fellows, and fellows more favorable than evaluators. But this general rule held within a context of over-all favorableness toward the program. Specific evidence of the widespread approval that was generated may be found throughout the results. The extent of this approval may be illustrated by the fact that 82% of the fellows reported that their own program was either usually stimulating and interesting or stimulating and interesting throughout. Responses by faculty members and program directors to the identical item were even more favorable. Similarly, the majority of respondents in each of the four roles -- directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluators -- reported that the Program had clearly met the educational needs of the fellows. Even the few evaluation teams which were sharply critical of an individual program took care to comment favorably on the over-all concept of the ExTFP.

There was, of course, a considerable variation among institutions in the evaluations that were received: some programs were given extremely high ratings, a few received relatively low evaluations. It must be stressed again, however, that this variation took place around an average value that was very favorable, indeed.

2. Although there was a high degree of solidarity and morale among fellows in the average program, the level of solidarity and morale correlated positively with judgments of effectiveness.

Again, there was considerable variation in the level of morale and solidarity that characterized the different institutions. Even so, the average program received high ratings on morale and solidarity from directors, faculty members, fellows, and evaluators. Beyond this, there were consistent positive correlations between estimates of solidarity and morale and judgments of the effectiveness of individual programs: programs where morale and solidarity were high also received high ratings on effectiveness and participant satisfaction; when morale and solidarity were low, so were ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness.

3. The amount of work assigned was heavy, and inversely related to effectiveness and satisfaction.

Of the 31 evaluation teams, none said the fellows' work load was too light, while 21 said it was in some degree too heavy; of 940 fellows, only 6 said the load was too light and 440 said it was "too heavy to allow completion of assignments and independent work." Of particular interest was the inverse relationship between fellows' and evaluators' judgments on this question and the various measures of satisfaction and effectiveness: institutions where the amount of work required was judged to be inordinately high were consistently ranked as relatively ineffective. It should be noted that this relationship held for the absolute amount of work that was required, not for the amount of competitiveness that was fostered between fellows. In the average program, fellows reported a fairly large amount of competition with one another; however, these latter ratings did not relate consistently either to judgments of the over-all work load or to ratings of effectiveness and satisfaction.

4. Respondents in different roles disagreed as to whether the programs were built upon the extensive backgrounds of the fellows. Judgments by fellows and evaluators on this question correlated positively, however, with measure of effectiveness.

Almost all of the program directors and a large majority of the faculty reported that the curriculum at their institution utilized and built upon the experience of the fellows; most of the evaluation teams indicated the reverse; answers by the fellows to this question were intermediate, but more similar to the faculty's than to the evaluators'. Despite their disagreement in the level at which they felt the fellows' experience was utilized, evaluation teams and fellows agreed in their rankings of institutions on their achievement of this goal. Furthermore, those programs which, according to fellows and evaluators, managed somehow to build upon the fellows' experience received more favorable ratings on program effectiveness than those which did not.

5. Respondents in different roles disagreed as to the extent of cooperation among programs and the amount of innovation in the programs. Although departmental cooperation was correlated with program effectiveness, this was not true of innovation.

For the most part, directors and faculty members involved in the Program reported that

cooperation among different departments was good, that the Program had considerable effects on teacher-education procedures, and that it contributed to the plans for development of the department and institution concerned. Evaluation teams did not make such favorable judgments. Although in some institutions evaluators said that the Program had affected interdepartmental cooperation, teacher training, or departmental development, in as many other institutions evaluators felt that it had little effect on such policies. It seems likely that the evaluators' judgments were somewhat closer to reality than those of the directors and faculty; that within the few months of the Program's operation it had effected few, if any, really substantial changes in the structure of most of the host institutions. It is worth noting, however, that there was a positive correlation between judgments of program effectiveness on the one hand and, on the other, reports by evaluators and by fellows of effective interdepartmental cooperation.

As with judgments of effects upon host institutions, program directors and faculty members were much more likely than evaluators to report that their programs contained imaginative innovations. Again it is likely that the evaluators' judgments were more objective than those by the other two groups, and that as many programs introduced few educational innovations as introduced many. It is noteworthy that evaluator estimates of the extent of innovations was uncorrelated with judgments of program effectiveness.

As adequate a summary as any of the effects of the Program upon the host institution can be given by quoting from an interim report on this project, written in May, 1967:

The Programs appear to have been least effective in overcoming the traditional patterns of organization in colleges and universities. Thus, the most common complaints [by evaluation teams] dealt with the similarity of these programs to traditional undergraduate and graduate education, the imposition of a common body of required courses upon all participants, the failure to adjust the curriculum to the needs of individual students, the absence of true collaboration between different departments of the same institution, or the unconcern of the staff for the response to the Program of the fellows as a group. All of these complaints are commonly voiced throughout higher education in America; they are not unique to the Experienced Teachers Fellowship Program. It is significant that a considerable number of institutions were adjudged to provide for their fellows an unusual and rewarding educational experience, some by following traditional educational patterns, other by breaking with tradition and establishing novel and exciting educational procedures.

6. The program director has an extremely important role in determining the effectiveness of individual programs.

A partial enumeration of the functions that a program director performs yields a list of impressive length. He should be directly involved in deciding upon the course content and the mode of organization of the program, he must make sure that the formal courses and

the supplemental activities are coordinated, must arrange for the presence of whatever educational materials are required, must encourage informal exchanges among fellows and between fellows and staff, must try to mediate in disputes that may develop among participants, must ascertain the fellows' and the faculty's views and criticisms of the program and its effectiveness, must decide whether changes in procedures or content are required, and, when the decision is affirmative, must determine what changes to make in the program and how to make them. In a program whose success relies in good part upon the establishment of high esprit de corps among participants and upon the group's performance en bloc, the fulfillment of these functions can be critically important. There are doubtless some programs which run smoothly from beginning to end, never requiring the mediating influence of a skillful administrator. In the typical institution, however, at some time during the year crises arise, interests conflict, difficulties occur which require effective administrative action. At such times it is essential that the program director possess the ability, the time, and especially, the institutional power to respond effectively to the demands of the situation.

III. The Population and the Programs

We have already remarked that the ExTFP embraced a wide variety of offerings. Programs varied as to types of institutions that were involved, the geographic region where the institutions were located, the characteristics of fellows enrolled, and the subject matter that was offered. Beyond this, they differed remarkably in the pedagogical strategies that were adopted. Some programs were innovative, others were traditional. Some programs strove for competitiveness among fellows, while others sought a non-competitive atmosphere. Certain programs maintained formal relationships between fellows and faculty, but others were more informal. The programs and the individuals involved in them differed in these general ways and in all other ways in which people differ. Our purpose in this section of the report is to summarize some of the characteristics of the fellows, the faculty, and the programs. In succeeding sections, we shall discuss reactions to these programs, and shall look for variables that correlated with their effectiveness. It may sometimes appear that the differences among programs are obscured in the course of this analysis, that diversity is reduced to uniformity. If so, the reader should bear in mind that we are seeking for whatever underlying constancy there may be beneath the remarkable surface diversity.

A. Characteristics of the Participants

1. Personal Characteristics

In certain of their personal characteristics the group of fellows was not entirely representative of teachers as a whole. Men made up 51% of the group, no doubt a higher proportion than obtains among teachers in general. In addition, the group was relatively young, with 79% being younger than 40 and 28% younger than 30. Despite their relative youth, the participants were not inexperienced in teaching. Ninety-two percent reported three or more years of experience in education; 59% had six or more years of experience; however, only 24% had ten or more years of experience. The participants' experience spanned all levels of elementary and secondary education; 32% had been principally involved at the high school level, 21% at the junior high school level, 45% at the elementary level, and 2.6% in preschool or kindergarten teaching.

Apparently, the fellows' considerable experience and training had not been primarily in the subject matter areas of their respective programs, for sixty-one percent had worked as "specialists" in their areas for less than 3 years, while only 28% reported taking as many as 30 semester hours of undergraduate credit in their specialty -- the presumed equivalent of an undergraduate major. Seventy percent had taken fewer than 10 hours of graduate credit in their special area, and a third reported no graduate courses at all in that area. Two thirds had never attended an NDEA summer institute or similar training program, and only a tenth had attended more than one such program.

It is noteworthy that only 3% of the participants had held administrative jobs when they entered the program. Of those not in administrative positions, 55% said they "probably" or "definitely" would not go into full-time educational administration, while only 6% said they definitely expected to do so. Upon completion of the program, these fellows will doubtless be in a favored position on the promotional ladder of their home school systems; their apparent reluctance to move into administrative positions bespeaks a strong commitment to classroom teaching. It will be important to examine, in future years, the actual career patterns of these fellows.

2. Characteristics of Fellows' Home Communities and Schools

Fellows were distributed according to the size of the communities they came from in numbers roughly proportional to the distribution in the population as a whole. Thirty-three percent were from communities with less than 2,500 residents, 40% from towns or cities with populations between 2,500 and 100,000, 16% from cities between 100,000 and 500,000 population, and 19% from cities of over 500,000. Only 14% of the fellows identified their school system as being in a suburb or satellite city.

At least some participants came from each part of the country. The Western and Midwestern states were somewhat over-represented, with 24% and 33%, respectively, of all participants; 23% of the fellows were from the North Atlantic states, about the same proportion as in the population at large; the Southeastern, South Central, and Southwestern states were somewhat under-represented, comprising only 19% of the total.

As to school enrollment, there were fellows from schools with fewer than 200 students, others from schools with over 2,000, and still others in every category intermediate between these extremes.

Most commonly, fellows reported that their students came from families of middle income. Families with low but steady income were reported next most frequently, and either wealthy families or those in poverty were reportedly a small minority of the clientele of most fellows' schools. Sixty-eight percent reported that the pupils in their home schools were "all or mostly white"; the remainder reported that their pupils were predominantly Spanish-speaking, Indian, Negro, or a combination of two or more ethnic groups. Only about 15% of the school-age children in America are nonwhite; therefore, it appears that the proportion of teachers in the ExTFP who came from classrooms with substantial numbers of nonwhite children was somewhat greater than in the nation as a whole. Since five of the 50 programs were for teachers of the disadvantaged, such an outcome is not surprising.

3. Ability and Interests of Fellows

No information is available concerning the fellows' performance on standardized tests of ability. However, there were items on each of the questionnaires which requested

fellows, faculty, and directors to estimate the fellows' ability. By all three sets of judgments, the fellows came off extremely well. Thus, 83% of the fellows said that the participants' ability was above average and 95% reported that fellows seemed genuinely interested in the subject matter.

The faculty and directors were asked to compare the ability of the ExTFP fellows with that of their institution's regular graduate students. The results of these comparisons are summarized in Table 1. It is clear that the fellows were viewed very favorably by both sources, with program directors being consistently more favorable than the faculty. Note that more than half the faculty and directors reported that fellows were more industrious, more serious, and had greater initiative than their regular graduate students; nearly as much preference was given to fellows over graduate students in their commitment to the discipline and their ability to communicate. The faculty thought that the two groups were about equal in intellectual ability, while directors favored the fellows; similarly, the faculty rated graduate students somewhat higher than fellows in knowledge of the discipline, while directors' ratings were the reverse. Considering that graduate students constitute a very select group for comparison, these results provide an extremely favorable picture of the fellows' capacities.

Table 1. Comparisons of Fellows with Typical Graduate Students Made by Faculty and Program Directors

Variable	Source of Rating	Percent ¹ Who Rated Participants		
		Better	Equal	Worse
Intellectual ability	Faculty	24	46	28
	Directors	29	56	13
Industriousness	Faculty	60	33	2
	Directors	65	31	0
Seriousness	Faculty	66	27	3
	Directors	67	29	0
Commitment to discipline	Faculty	46	34	14
	Directors	67	20	9
Knowledge of discipline	Faculty	25	38	30
	Directors	34	38	22
Ability to communicate	Faculty	40	45	13
	Directors	43	44	9
Initiative	Faculty	53	40	4
	Directors	64	27	4

¹Since non-respondents are not included in this table, the percentages in each row do not total 100.

It is of interest, as well, to examine what the fellows considered to be their greatest problem before enrolling in the ExTFP. They reported as follows:

23%	Using effective teaching methods
20%	Knowledge of the subject matter
16%	Motivating students
14%	Determining what is most important to teach
12%	Handling students of low ability
6%	Knowledge of appropriate materials
3%	Encouraging and stimulating gifted students

One derives from these data a picture of a young, energetic, serious, industrious group of teachers, with considerable experience and a strong commitment to their work. The communities that the fellows were drawn from seem to be approximately representative of the nation as a whole except, perhaps, that the South was somewhat under-represented and that schools with substantial numbers of nonwhite students were somewhat over-represented. The fact that fellows were relatively untrained in the specialized subject matter of their programs, combined with their intellectual ability and their sincerity of purpose, suggests that they were especially likely to benefit from their graduate work.

B. Characteristics of the Faculty

The educational and professional background of faculty members in the ExTFP was impressive. Seventy-three percent held either the Ph.D. or the Ed.D. degree; 80% had taught at the college level for three or more years, 60% for six or more years, and 25% for more than 16 years. In addition, 37% had taught for at least a year in elementary school and 51% had a year or more of experience at the secondary level. Thus, many of the faculty were acquainted at first hand with the educational settings from which the participants came and for which they were being trained.

Two sets of questions bear on the quality of instruction at the different institutions, one set from the evaluation teams, the other from the fellows. When asked to comment on the qualifications of the teaching staff, 28 of the 31 evaluation teams rated them on the "qualified" side of the continuum, two placed their ratings at the midpoint, and only one team rated the staff as slightly unqualified.

The fellows' ratings of the faculty are similar to those that would be given by college students in a course that was somewhat better than average. Thus, over two-thirds of the fellows rated the quality of lectures as good or excellent; 56% gave the same evaluation to seminars and structured discussions. The great majority of fellows said that the lectures were seldom or never over their heads (a response which might, in fact, be either positive or negative), that the instructors did not talk down to them, and that the lectures dealt with various approaches to the subject. However, 41% believed that lectures were sometimes or usually dominated by detail or unrelated facts, and a slight majority

(51%) reported that the faculty had little or no knowledge of the practical problems of school teachers. It should be noted that this last opinion does not wholly square with the faculty members' reports of their own background in elementary and secondary school teaching.

In sum, the instructors at the various institutions seem to have been quite well qualified. Reactions of fellows to the teaching were mixed, although on the positive side. The response to lectures and seminars was quite positive; on the other hand, there was some feeling -- based, perhaps, on the academic nature of most programs and on the fellows' concern about the material's applicability in the classroom -- that not enough attention was given to the "practical" problems of teachers.

C. Characteristics of the Programs

The guidelines for proposals for the ExTFP emphasized en bloc programming, cooperation between education and subject-matter departments, and attention to the special character and experience of the participants. These requirements demanded of program planners a type of co-ordination that may not have been in effect at many institutions. Although the guidelines specifically stated that educational innovation was not a requirement for proposals, in fact the proposals which were funded were novel and extremely diverse.¹ It is this diversity which is most characteristic of the group of programs as a whole. Of the 50 programs, the largest number whose titles were approximately similar is four, and there seem to be 24 different kinds of programs indicated by the titles alone. Actually, except for the structural uniformities called for by the guidelines, there was little similarity between any two programs on more than a few dimensions. The dimensions along which programs varied may conveniently be divided into two classes, (1) organizational and situational characteristics and (2) goals and rationale.

Organizational and situational characteristics. The vast majority (84%) of the programs were situated, geographically, in one of three areas, the Midwest (38%), West (25%) or Northeast (21%). The remaining 16% of the programs were scattered across the Southeast, South Central, and Southwest regions.

The programs ranged in size from 5 to 25 participants, with 25 the most common number (34%), followed by 20 (28%) and 15 (20%). Only two programs had a participant group of 5 or fewer. The guidelines specified there should be cooperation between education and subject matter departments, but in every case one department bore primary responsibility as "home" for the program. The programs were approximately equally divided in their locations, with 29 programs based in education departments and 21 based in other departments.

¹One reason for the novelty and diversity among the 50 programs that were actually funded may be that the advisory panels used innovation and diversity as criteria in deciding which proposals to recommend for approval or disapproval, even though these criteria were not specifically set forth in the guidelines.

Great latitude was permitted to institutions in the actual functioning of the programs. For instance, many awarded an MA degree at the completion of the program, others provided the possibility of an MA upon completion of some further work, and some made no provision for an advanced degree at all. Among those awarding an MA degree, some required a thesis, most did not. The choices of teaching techniques were related to the goals of the programs, but again there were great variations among programs with apparently similar goals. Some programs, particularly those whose purpose seemed to be to upgrade and educate teachers in existing areas such as History or Mathematics, provided a menu of conventional courses from which participants selected, much as in a conventional MA program. Others, particularly those programs which reportedly they were training for a "new" kind of function, such as media consultant or teacher of the disadvantaged, provided a real "bloc" of courses identical for each participant, and often very different from any courses taught elsewhere in the institution. Seminars, workshops and practica were in general more common in the latter programs than in conventional graduate sequences.

As to the goals which programs pursued, their diversity has already been mentioned. Programs ranged from fairly conventional, though certainly important, attempts to upgrade the content, knowledge, and techniques of teachers of English, History, or Geography to the creation of a "unique person in the educational setting" such as a centralized media specialist or an educational systems analyst. There were five programs to train teachers of different disadvantaged groups, including rural Alaskan Indians, Texas Mexican-Americans, and Harlem Negroes.

In 18 programs the principal emphasis was on secondary school teachers, in 17 the emphasis was at the primary level, and at least four covered both levels. In addition, there were 10 programs for the training of coordinating or advisory personnel, such as guidance counselors, media specialists and school librarians.

IV. A Profile of Reactions to the Program

This section of the report will consider reactions to the Program by fellows, faculty members, directors, and evaluators. It begins with the degree of satisfaction that was expressed, then proceeds to various judgments of the Program's effectiveness. A discussion then follows of how and whether the various programs implemented the three requirements regarding program structure that were spelled out in the guidelines: the importance of an en bloc approach, the necessity for subject-matter and teacher education departments to work closely with each other, and the requirement that relationships be established with the local school systems. Finally, we will discuss what might be called the "strategy of operation" adopted by the different programs, including the extent to which the programs made use of the extensive experience of the fellows, the amount of competitiveness that was fostered among fellows, their work load, the extent of faculty involvement in the program, and the amount of innovation in the curriculum.

A. Satisfaction and Effectiveness

It is not easy to differentiate between a person's satisfaction with an educational program and his judgments of its effectiveness. Presumably, the two kinds of responses should vary with one another, and, as we shall see in the next section, they do co-vary to a remarkable degree. Nevertheless, the distinction seems worthwhile since satisfaction with a program refers to one's overall emotional response, whereas effectiveness is judged according to achievement of goals by the respondent. Thus, a program might conceivably be effective without necessarily producing high levels of satisfaction among the participants, and vice versa. We consider, first, the extent of satisfaction with the ExTFP, then judgments of its effectiveness.

1. Satisfaction With the Program

Two questions which appear to reflect satisfaction with the ExTFP were included in substantially the same form in the questionnaires given to the fellows, to the faculty, and to the directors. One of these deals directly with reactions to the Program:

Which of the following alternatives best describes your reaction to the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

- ☐ It was a stimulating and interesting experience throughout.
- ☐ It was usually stimulating and interesting.
- ☐ It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting.
- ☐ It was seldom or never stimulating and interesting.

A comparison of the responses of the three groups is given in Table 2. Clearly, the reaction in every group was overwhelmingly favorable, with faculty members somewhat more favorable than fellows, and directors the most favorable of all. It should be under-

lined that among even the least enthusiastic group, the fellows in the program, 82% reported that the ExTFP was either usually stimulating and interesting or stimulating and interesting throughout.

Table 2. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of How Stimulating and Interesting They Found the Program

Source	Percent Saying ExTFP Was Stimulating and Interesting			
	Throughout	Usually	Occasionally	Seldom or Never
Faculty	42	46	8	1
Directors	60	38	2	0
Fellows	32	50	16	1

The second item that may be considered a measure of satisfaction asked faculty and fellows for a comparison of the Program with a typical eight-week summer institute. Faculty members and directors who had taught in such programs, but not those who had not, were asked to compare the ExTFP with NDEA or NSF academic year or summer institutes. Since fellows had earlier reported whether they had ever attended such institutes, it was possible to divide them into two groups: those with and those without prior institute experience. The four sets of comparisons of the ExTFP with other institutes are presented in Table 3.

Again, it is evident that the response to the ExTFP was overwhelmingly favorable. On this item, the fellows were more likely than the other two groups to view the ExTFP as superior to other institutes, and those who had not taken part in such institutes were somewhat more favorable than those who had. Again, the directors showed somewhat greater approval of the ExTFP than did the faculty. Of greater importance than these inter-group comparisons, however, is the fact that only a tiny fraction of the respondents in any group felt that other kinds of institutes were superior to the ExTFP.

¹ It must be emphasized that these judgments are almost certainly expressions of satisfaction with the ExTFP instead of a true reflection of the relative effectiveness of that Program and other institutes. Many factors were involved in these responses: fellows in the ExTFP had committed a full year or longer to that program; their stipends were larger than those paid in the summer institutes and they extended over a full year instead of eight weeks; many of the ExTFP fellows were receiving advanced degrees or credit toward such degrees. In short, ExTFP fellows and staff were comparing a present valued experience to a distant one; their comparisons can hardly be considered unbiased judgments of effectiveness; as expressions of satisfaction, however, the results are impressive.

Table 3. Comparisons by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of ExTFP and Other Institutes

Source	Percent of Group in Each Response Category				
	ExTFP Superior	ExTFP Somewhat Better	About the Same	Institute Somewhat Better	Institute Superior
Faculty with Institute Experience (N=57)	28%	21%	37%	9%	5%
Directors with Institute Experience (N=21)	52%	19%	19%	5%	5%
Fellows without Institute Experience (N=486) ¹	80%	13%	5%	1%	1%
Fellows with Institute Experience (N=312)	65%	18%	8%	6%	2%

¹ A number of respondents omitted this item; the totals on which the responses are based are those who actually responded.

2. Judgments of Program Effectiveness

Unfortunately, the questionnaire method does not provide a fully satisfactory means of determining the effectiveness of an educational program. Subjective ratings can provide, at best, imperfect estimates of what a student has learned from a set of material or of how well his new knowledge will be applied when he returns to his earlier role. Whether a student has profited a little or a great deal from a program should be assessed by comparing what he knows at the program's end with what he knew at its beginning; similarly, whether he will apply what he has learned can be determined adequately only by observing his performance on his home grounds. Nevertheless, in the absence of more reliable measures of program effectiveness, the subjective ratings that are obtained in questionnaires are considerably better than no estimates of effectiveness at all. Especially when the respondents are experienced judges of the effectiveness of educational programs -- and such is certainly the case in the present study -- one can expect their replies to the questionnaire to relate positively, if imperfectly, to more objective measures of program effectiveness. With the material at hand, we have no choice but to use questionnaire ratings of effectiveness. We cannot estimate the degree to which these ratings correspond to the "true" effectiveness of the different programs; nevertheless, we can reasonably assume that there is considerable validity in these judgments.

There was only one question relating to effectiveness which asked for approximately the same kind of judgment from faculty, directors, fellows, and evaluators. The form the question took varied considerably from one questionnaire to another. In the faculty and director questionnaires, respondents were asked: "In your opinion, were the educational needs of the participants met by the program?" Fellows were first asked to check, from among seven different teaching problems, the one that had concerned them most before they enrolled in the ExTFP. In the next item they were asked: "To what extent did the program this year meet that problem?" Finally, evaluation teams were asked to rate, on a seven-point scale, whether the program seemed to meet the needs of the participants. Responses of the four groups to these items are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Estimates by Faculty, Directors, Fellows, and Evaluators of Whether the ExTFP Met Fellows' Needs

	Were the educational needs of participants met?			
	Definitely	Probably	I doubt it	Not at all
Faculty	42%	49%	4%	0%
Directors	67%	31%	1%	0%
	To what extent did the program meet (your major teaching) problem?			
	To a great degree	To a moderate degree	To a slight degree	Not at all
Fellows	35%	39%	21%	6%
	Did the program seem to meet the needs of participants?			
	Well	Neutral	Poorly	
Evaluators	51%	32%	16%	

It is evident that the directors and faculty were both confident that the fellows' educational needs had been met, with the directors, once more, somewhat more positive than the faculty. The confidence of these two groups in the effectiveness of the Program is further revealed by their responses to two other questions. When asked whether the ExTFP resulted in the participants becoming better teachers, 72% of the faculty replied "yes" and 24% were uncertain (presumably for lack of direct observation of the fellows' teaching); the corresponding proportions for directors were 80% and 13%. Similarly, 92% of the faculty and 100% of the directors reported, in another item, that the overall program was either valuable or very valuable for the participants.

It may be seen in Table 4 that 74% of the fellows reported that the program had met their major problem to at least a moderate degree. While this is a substantial majority, it also leaves one fellow in four feeling that his major teaching problem was met to only a slight degree (21%) or not at all (6%). This outcome should not be taken as evidence that one fourth of the fellows thought the program was ineffective. It seems more likely that the ExTFP was not specifically directed at the major teaching problem of many of the fellows. For example, the major problem of 28% of the fellows was either motivating students or handling students of low ability; it is doubtful that most programs focused their instruction on those topics. A related item on the fellows' questionnaire asked them how useful the program had been in preparing them to handle their own teaching situations. Seventy-nine percent reported the program as moderately or extremely useful, 18% as somewhat useful, and only 3% as being of no use at all.

From Table 4 it appears that evaluators were somewhat less impressed with the effectiveness of the programs than were the other three groups. Just over half of the evaluation teams said the institutions they visited had met participants' needs well, while five teams said these needs were less than adequately met. These last five teams of evaluators remarked on the similarity of the programs they visited to regular undergraduate and graduate training, and also on the lack of adequate practicum experience. A much more favorable view of the programs was expressed in evaluators' judgments of whether the fellows would be able to apply what they had learned when they returned to their schools. Twenty-three of the 31 teams reported in the affirmative, four placed their ratings at the midpoint, and only four teams said that the students they observed were somewhat unlikely to be able to apply what they had learned. Several teams remarked that their judgments were less favorable than they might have been because they feared that traditionalist or money-conscious school systems might resist the introduction of some of the material the fellows would bring back with them from their year of training. A final indication of evaluators' views of the effectiveness of the Program comes from an analysis of the general comments they wrote at the end of the evaluators form. These comments revealed a clear acceptance, by all evaluators, of the general value of the ExTFP. Even those few evaluation teams which expressed rather extreme criticism of the institutions they visited, expressed the view that the fellows had profited in some degree from their year of study. Their criticisms frequently stemmed from the conviction that substantially more could have been accomplished had the program been conducted differently.

In summary, it is clear that there was general satisfaction with the Program, and widespread agreement that it was an effective educational venture. It should not be surprising that the directors, faculty, and fellows expressed approval of the Program. When one devotes a full year to a project, there develops considerable internal pressure to view that project favorably. Despite this built-in bias, the overwhelming favorableness of the opinions given by these three sources strongly supports the conclusion that the ExTFP was a satisfying experience for fellows and staff alike. The evaluation teams had no personal involvement in the outcome of their evaluation. They were specifically assigned a critical role, and they measured the programs against high standards of success. Their generally positive evaluations provide further evidence of the program's effectiveness.

B. Structural Aspects of the Programs

Doubtless because of the lack of specificity in the guidelines, there was considerable variation in the pattern of organization adopted by different institutions in implementing the ExTFP. Since only a limited number of items dealt with such questions, many of these differences in program structure went unrecorded. Only three structural aspects of the programs will be dealt with here, all of them specifically discussed in the guidelines for proposals: the utilization of the en bloc approach, the relationship among teacher-education and content departments, and the pattern of relationship with local school systems.

1. The en bloc Approach, Group Solidarity, and Morale

Only one question dealt specifically with adoption of the en bloc approach. This was an item in the Visitors Evaluation Form which stated, "Unlike conventional graduate programs, the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is based upon a block or group program approach. The intent is to use the group to enhance learning by building morale and esprit de corps. Has this been successful?"

Evaluators' responses make it clear that the en bloc approach was, indeed, successful: 12 evaluation teams reported that the approach was extremely successful and 13 others rated the approach as successful, but not extremely so. Only three teams said that the approach was in some degree unsuccessful.

Although the en bloc approach was not mentioned in the other three questionnaires, all three groups were asked whether there was a feeling of group solidarity among participants in the program; in addition, respondents were asked to rate the overall morale of the participants. The responses of the three groups are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Ratings by Faculty, Directors, and Fellows of Group Solidarity and Morale

Source	a. Was there a feeling of group solidarity? Percent Answering			
	Strong	Considerable	Some	None
Faculty	53	38	5	1
Directors	67	27	7	0
Fellows	46	38	14	1
Source	b. How would you rate fellows' morale?			
	Very High	Pretty High	Average	Low and Very Low
Faculty	23	51	14	4
Directors	38	42	18	2
Fellows	22	38	27	10

By every measure, solidarity and morale were high. Again, the directors' estimates of both variables were somewhat higher than those by the faculty, and the faculties' estimates were higher than those by the fellows. Even among the fellows only 1% said there was no feeling of solidarity and only 10% reported that the group's morale was below average. It should be mentioned that there was considerable homogeneity within groups of fellows in their judgments of solidarity. That is, reports of relatively low solidarity were concentrated in particular institutions; they were not made by social isolates scattered among a number of programs but probably reflected, instead, a real lack of solidarity in a few of the programs.

2. Cooperation between Departments

It will be recalled that the guidelines for the ExTFP specifically called for cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education departments in conducting the program. Three questions, one each from the fellows, the directors, and the evaluators questionnaires, asked whether such cooperation was achieved.

In some institutions, such cooperation apparently did not extend much beyond consultation on the initial application. When asked whether the director of teacher-education was involved in the operation of the ExTFP, only 26% of the program directors replied that he was either quite involved or very much involved; just over half said he was not very involved, and another 20% reported that he was not involved at all. This question, of course, asked only about the director of teacher education, not whether there was cooperation with others in lesser positions in the teacher-education hierarchy. In fact, when they were asked to describe the cooperation they received from other academic departments, 91% of the directors said it was either quite good or unusually good. This suggests that some collaboration must have taken place between teacher-education and subject-matter departments, or at least that the directors thought so. Evaluators' reports indicate that interdepartmental cooperation varied widely from one institution to another. While only one evaluation team reported very close cooperation between the two departments, another 12 placed their ratings at the cooperative side of the continuum. On the other hand, 15 of the evaluators' judgments were on the uncooperative side; in five of these institutions evaluators said there was no cooperation at all between teacher-education and subject-matter departments.

Responses by fellows show much the same picture as those by evaluators. Eighty-four percent of the fellows reported that their instruction involved more than one academic department. Exactly half of these, 42% of the total group, said the material was coordinated either quite well or extremely well; the other half, again 42% of the total group, said the material was either not coordinated too well or was not coordinated at all. We should recognize, however, that this question does not bear directly on the point at issue, for the second department which the fellows had in mind need not have been the department of teacher education. One other item on the participants' questionnaire had at least a tangential bearing on this question. In response to a question about the relative emphasis on subject matter and teaching methods, the majority of fellows, 64% said that the balance was about right, 28% reported that there was too much emphasis on subject matter, and only 3% reported too much emphasis on teaching methods.

3. Cooperation with Local School Systems

Only one question dealt with this topic: evaluators were asked to report how extensive the relationships were between colleges and universities and cooperating school districts. Again, there were great differences from one institution to another: fourteen institutions were rated on the low end of this continuum, 12 at the high end, and five at the midpoint. In the evaluators' written comments about the programs, some of the most caustic had to do with the lack of practicum experiences available to fellows in those institutions without relationships to cooperative school systems.

To summarize, the en bloc approach seems to have been effective in most of the institutions that participated in the ExTFP; it was accompanied by a high degree of solidarity in most of the groups, and by reports of high morale among the fellows. In the matter of cooperation between teacher-education and subject-matter departments, the program does not come off so well. It appears that while there was substantial cooperation in some institutions, in others there was little or none. The same wide range held true for the extent of cooperation between the participating institutions and local school systems.

C. Operating Strategies

Even when programs have the same formal structure, the mode of operation may differ greatly along a variety of dimensions. Since it is known, for example, that graduate programs in American universities differ in the degree of competitiveness that they foster among graduate students, it would be expected that ExTF programs would vary in this regard. Similarly, universities, and by extension the ExTF programs, differ widely in the extent of faculty involvement with students and in faculty commitment to instruction.

Beyond this, the nature of the ExTFP suggests that there are other dimensions along which variation may be expected. The experience of teaching for a number of years has provided each fellow in the Program with a degree of specialization in his field, an awareness of the problems that are involved in teaching his subject, and an intellectual and emotional maturity that set him apart from the typical graduate and undergraduate student. His response to the program of courses that is offered should depend, in considerable part, on whether and how that program builds upon and utilizes his extensive experience.

We turn now to a discussion of differences among institutions in these aspects.

1. Utilization of Fellows' Background

All four sources -- fellows, faculty, directors, and evaluators -- were asked, in one way or another, whether they felt the program had taken advantage of the rich experience and prior preparation of the fellows. Although these questions were phrased differently for different populations, the four sets of responses have been grouped so that they are roughly comparable; they are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Judgments of Whether Programs Built Upon Fellows' Experience and Preparation¹

Source	Percent of Each Group Responding		
	Yes	Uncertain	No
Faculty	66	23	6
Directors	89	7	4
Fellows	63	24	12
Evaluators	32	16	52

¹In the faculty and directors questionnaires, the alternatives for respondents to check were "Yes," "Uncertain," and "No." Fellows who said that the program usually or consistently built on their backgrounds have been scored as replying "Yes," those who said it rarely did so are scored as "Uncertain," and those who said it was unconcerned for their background are scored as saying "No." Evaluators' responses are recorded as "Yes," "Uncertain," or "No" according to whether their judgments were on the positive side of the midpoint, at the midpoint, or on the negative side.

Clearly there was a considerable difference among sources in their judgments of whether the programs took account of fellows' backgrounds. Program directors were most likely to say that the programs had built on fellows' backgrounds; faculty members and fellows were somewhat less certain, but the clear majority of these two groups agreed with the directors that the program utilized the fellows' prior experience. Real disagreement with these judgments was shown by the evaluation teams, over half of whom said that the institutions they visited had not designed their programs to take account of fellows' experience. The comments of those teams that were critical, on these grounds, of the institutions they visited were examined in some detail. In an interim report, based on about half of these responses, comments by critical evaluation teams were summarized in a manner which holds true after the remainder of the data have been collected:

Most commonly, [evaluators who were critical] remarked that fellows were treated like regular graduate students, complete with the institution of multiple-choice examinations and competition for letter grades, with the prescription of a fixed schedule of courses, with little tailoring of individual programs to the needs of individual fellows, and with little or no opportunity for fellows to exchange ideas with one another about their own experiences. In short, ...these institutions offered substantially the same kinds of programs they had always offered.

Why the other three sources at those same institutions should so strongly disagree with the evaluators' judgments remains unclear. Perhaps in their involvement with one institution, they were unable to conceive of the range of alternative policies that the evaluators envisioned; as a consequence, policies that these sources thought were major concessions to the fellows' experience may have been viewed by evaluators as modest efforts, at best. That faculty members and program directors actually did believe they had utilized the fellows' experience is made evident by their replies to a question asking whether their program was modified to take advantage of the experience and background of participants. Sixty-two percent of the directors and 36% of the faculty answered this question affirmatively, 9% and 40% were uncertain, and only 27% and 16% answered "no."

2. Competitiveness and Work Load

Our interest in discussing the extent of competitiveness and the size of fellows' work load is not to determine whether participants in the ExTFP worked or loafed, but to see whether they thought they were overworked and how intense was the competition among fellows. Unfortunately, the question that was asked of faculty members and directors appears to have been relevant to the first question, not to the second. It asked whether the students worked hard during the year. Eighty-four percent of the program directors and 79% of the faculties replied "Yes." A bare 13% and 15% respectively of the two groups said, "Yes, too hard." The remaining few respondents were uncertain or reported that fellows had not worked hard. In retrospect, these replies seem to reflect the respondents' approval of fellows in their programs more than their evaluation of the fellows' work load.

By contrast, fellows were about evenly divided between the opinion that their work load was about right (52% of the respondents) and the view that it was too heavy to allow completion of assignments and independent work (47%). Ratings by the evaluator teams also indicated that the work load in some schools was heavy: 10 of the 31 teams reported that the work load at the institution they visited was about right, the remaining 21 said that the work load was in some degree too heavy. As to competitiveness, 60% of the fellows said that the level of competition in their program was either quite high or extremely high, 31% said it was about right, and only 8% said it was either low or very low. It should be mentioned that there was considerable homogeneity of judgments on these items among fellows in the same programs; that is, in certain programs almost all of the fellows said the work load was too heavy, in others, almost all said it was about right.

A cogent comment on these judgments is the remark that graduate education involves a great deal of work wherever it occurs. Indeed, many of the evaluation teams who rated the work load as somewhat too heavy observed that such is the norm in graduate school, and that after the program was over fellows might cherish their experience the more for the fact that strenuous demands had been made of them. Nevertheless, it appears that some institutions did require far more work than their fellows could produce, thereby introducing severe emotional stress into the academic program.

3. Involvement of the Faculty

Assignment to teach in the ExTFP might have been accepted by a faculty member as simply another unit in his teaching load, requiring no change in the kind of material he presented, in the way he presented it, or in his involvement with the students. Alternatively, it might have been viewed as a special challenge which called for a somewhat different orientation toward both the subject matter and the students. The tone of the guidelines makes it clear that their intent is for the second attitude to be dominant among the staff of the ExTFP. There were no items in any questionnaire that dealt directly with the mode of orientation of the faculty, but there were a number that skirted it; we turn our attention now to those items.

Faculty members and program directors were asked whether they found the ExTFP a challenging and satisfying experience. As may be seen in Table 7, the majority of both groups replied in the affirmative to both questions. Program directors, once again, were somewhat more enthusiastic than the faculty.

Table 7. Ratings by Faculty and Directors of Whether the Program Was Challenging and Satisfying

Source	a. How Challenging was the ExTFP?			
	Extremely	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All
Faculty	47	42	5	0
Directors	64	31	0	0
Source	b. How satisfying was the ExTFP?			
	Extremely	Somewhat	Not Very	Not at All
Faculty	57	40	3	1
Directors	71	24	0	0

The enthusiasm of the directors and faculty for teaching in the program was clearly picked up by the evaluation teams, for 22 of the 31 reported that the director and staff were challenged and stimulated by the program; only 8 gave judgments that fell toward the opposite pole of the continuum.

Fellows were not asked about whether the staff was challenged by the program, but whether they were accessible and helpful to students. Their responses were overwhelmingly favorable on both counts: 94% reported that the staff was either usually or always accessible, 95% said it was either usually or always helpful.

Although, as we have seen, the faculty and directors reported being challenged and stimulated by the Program, they were less likely to report that the experience affected their own professional and intellectual growth. As may be seen in Table 8, only 41% of the faculty said their professional development was furthered either "greatly" or "very greatly" by the experience; only about 30% said it added greatly or very greatly to their intellectual growth and to their skill as teachers. Again, directors were more generous in their estimates of how much benefit they derived from the Program; 51% said it added greatly or very greatly to their professional growth, but only about a third judged it had a comparable effect on their intellectual growth or their skills as teachers. In each case, respondents' judgments of the benefits they derived from the program were less favorable than their ratings of the challenge and satisfaction they felt. It is not clear how much weight should be given to these results. Perhaps the experienced University teacher does not ordinarily profit in these ways from his teaching experience. In any case, it is clear that the experience may have been stimulating and challenging but was not viewed as educational for the majority of the staff.

Table 8. Judgments by Faculty and Directors of the Program's Effects on Their Own Development

Item	Source	Percent Responding ¹				
		Very Greatly	Greatly	Moderately	Little	Very Little
28. Add to profession growth and development?	Faculty Director	14	27	35	14	5
		18	36	42	2	0
29. Add to your intellectual growth?	Faculty Director	11	19	40	18	7
		9	29	56	4	0
30. Add to your skill as a teacher?	Faculty Director	10	19	42	19	4
		9	24	53	4	4

¹ Percentages in each row do not total to 100 because non-respondents are not included.

4. Departmental Innovativeness

It was not required that institutions prepare thoroughly innovative proposals in order that their programs be funded under the ExTFP. Instead, substantially traditional proposals were examined in competition with completely innovative ones; approval or disapproval for funding was not determined in terms of the program's novelty, but in terms of how effective it seemed likely to be in furthering the education of experienced teachers.

In the view of program directors, there was innovation in the great majority of the institutions. Of 42 directors who responded to this item, 32 said they had seen imaginative teaching methods and practices in their programs, 6 were unsure, and only 4 reported that they had not seen such practices. As usual, judgments by faculty members were less extreme: of 174 who responded to the item, 79 reported innovations, 22 were unsure, and 73 reported none.

The evaluation teams agreed more with the faculty than with the directors: 12 teams rated the institutions they visited as being on the innovative side of the midpoint, 12 ratings were on the noninnovative side, and the remaining 7 were exactly at the midpoint. None of the evaluator ratings fell in the most extreme categories, those which indicated either a great deal of imagination and innovation or none at all.

In summary, there was disagreement among sources on the extent to which they thought the programs had utilized the background and experience of fellows. The least enthusiastic source of ratings, the evaluators, judged that there were more institutions which did not make sufficient use of the fellows' experience than there were which did. Apparently, there were systematic differences between institutions in the amount of work assigned to students. In every institution a considerable amount of work was required, but in some the amount was enormous. By all accounts, the faculty was challenged and stimulated by the program, accessible and helpful to the fellows. Finally, it appears that programs were neither thoroughly innovational nor stodgily traditional.

5. Effects on Institutional Development

One of the benefits the Program might have wrought, indeed, one of the effects that was envisioned initially, was a strengthening of the participating institutions themselves, particularly in their on-going teacher education programs. Obviously, changes in the pattern of teacher education will have effects upon the preparation and later performance of those who are trained; therefore, it is important to determine whether the Program actually influenced educational patterns in the host institutions. Important though this question may be, it is uncertain whether it can be answered adequately by the present study. These data were collected in the first year of the Program's operation, barely eight months after it was instituted. Whatever effects it may ultimately have upon procedures for teacher training, these effects are not likely to have taken place by the time these data were collected. Consequently, the conclusions we may draw about such effects must inevitably be tentative.

Of the five items that dealt with this issue, two were global judgments, by the directors and the faculty, of the Program's "value to the institution." One evaluator item asked about the Program's contribution to the plans of the Department, and two items, from the evaluators and the directors, asked specifically about the Program's "impact on the on-going teacher education program." Thus there were three distinct, if related, issues involved in these items: value to the institution, contribution to department development, and impact on teacher education.

As was so often the case, judgments on these questions varied remarkably from one source to another (Table 9). More than three fourths of the faculty members and the directors reported that the Program was either "valuable" or "very valuable" to their institution.

On the other hand, among evaluation teams as many said the program's contribution to departmental development was slight or non-existent as said it was moderate or great (36%, in each case). The same divergence of opinion was found in judgments of the Program's effect on teacher education: 62% of the directors said its impact on teacher education was relatively large and only 23% said it was small; the corresponding figures for evaluation teams were 16% and 58%.

Table 9. Judgments by Faculty, Directors, and Evaluators of the Program's Effects Upon Institutional Development

Source	a. Percent saying Program's value to institution ¹				
	Great	Moderate	Undecided	Slight	None
Directors	42	44	9	2	0
Faculty	29	47	13	5	1
Evaluators	b. Contribution to departmental and institutional development				
	26	10	29	26	10
Directors	c. Impact on teacher education				
	24	38	13	16	7
Evaluators	6	10	26	26	32

¹To make results from three questionnaires comparable, responses to the Visitors Evaluation Form have been classified as follows: checks in either of the two most favorable categories are scored as judgments that the program had great effects; those in the third most favorable category are scored as reflecting moderate effects; those in the center category are classified as "undecided"; and responses are considered as imputing slight effects or none according to whether they fell in the third or in the two most unfavorable categories.

These differences in judgments by the different sources probably reflected a number of factors. For one thing, the directors and the faculty had more at stake in the Program than did the evaluators; no doubt this involvement influenced their judgments in a favorable direction. It is probably true, as well, that the different sources used different criteria to assess the effects of the Program; what looked like a remarkable advance in the context of a particular institution may have seemed trivial to an outside observer. Paradoxically, some of the disagreement in judgments may have occurred because institutional changes had been made before the ExTFP was undertaken. A few evaluation teams said the Program had little impact on teacher education because the existing procedures were advanced and effective. Program directors attributed more influence on teacher training to the Program than did the evaluators.

One determinant of whether a change was effected in the host institution's teacher-training practices was the division of the institution in which the ExTFP was located. All five of the institutions that evaluation teams rated above the midpoint on "impact on teacher education" were based in education departments. Judgments by evaluation teams of the extent to which departmental and institutional development were affected showed the same patterns: 7 of the 8 programs in which evaluation teams said the effects were greatest were based in education departments. Not surprisingly, then, educational changes were more likely when Departments of Education were directly responsible for the Program; stated somewhat differently, educational programs that were located in Liberal Arts departments did not have immediate effects on the policies of education departments.

D. General Summary of Impressions of the ExTFP

It is clearly evident from the results that have been reported in this section that the sources' evaluations of the ExTFP varied directly with their involvement in the program. Program directors, who probably had the most at stake in the enterprise, were thoroughly enthusiastic, not to say Pollyannaish, in their ratings. Regular faculty members and fellows, who were somewhat less personally involved than the directors, made judgments that were a little less enthusiastic than those of the directors. Evaluation teams, who spent only two days viewing the programs and who maintained calculated objectivity as their ideal, were able to temper their enthusiasm with criticism.

Yet it is the burden of this report that all four sources, including the evaluators, produced predominantly favorable judgments of the program. Furthermore, the responses of those who were involved in the program are not to be discredited simply because of their involvement. In all but a very few institutions, it appears, a group of highly qualified teachers were brought together with a group of intelligent, hard working, experienced, thoroughly committed students. When circumstances also promoted the development of strong group solidarity and high morale among the fellows, a truly impressive educational experience probably occurred. Even when the social context was less than ideal, the juxtaposition of a first-rate student body and a better-than-competent faculty doubtless produced educational effects that were considerably above the average.

V. Correlates of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

We have seen that satisfaction with the ExTFP and judgments of its effectiveness were both very positive. Nevertheless, there were consistent differences from one program to another in the extent of satisfaction of the various respondents and in the ratings of effectiveness that they gave. Our purpose in this section is to examine the relationship of other variables to judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction.

Two sources of evidence -- one qualitative, the other quantitative -- are used in this analysis. The qualitative material consists of comments by evaluation teams about the influence that program directors had upon the effectiveness of the ExTFP. This chapter begins with a discussion of these comments. The quantitative material is made up of correlations among responses to the various questionnaires; the analysis of this material constitutes the bulk of the chapter. A detailed summary is presented at the end of the chapter; readers who are unfamiliar with correlational materials may find it helpful to read this summary before examining the correlation tables in detail.

A. The Role of the Director in Program Effectiveness

Analysis of the role of the program's director in the operation of the ExTFP was not systematically built into the questionnaires and the evaluator's ratings. Nevertheless, reports from evaluation teams made it clear that the actions of the director were frequently crucial to the success or lack of success of individual programs. Once this became clear, the written comments of the evaluation teams were examined in detail to make whatever inferences were possible about this topic. Analysis of these comments may be summarized as follows:

It is apparent from the reports of evaluation teams that the quality of directors had a major impact on the conduct of programs. In general, when the evaluators commented on the ability, dedication, enthusiasm, availability, and seriousness of directors, they also rated the programs as effective and productive. When comments were made about the director's lack of status in the institution, when the directorship changed between the time of application and the time the program began, when tension ruled between the director and his staff, the program was characterized as weak, poorly planned, poorly integrated, and unproductive.

Because there was no provision in the guidelines stipulating that the director be given released time for his administrative duties, many directors lacked time to carry out their duties and lacked funds for necessary supporting work. In some cases, the director functioned as a coordinator rather than an administrator, with neither the

¹Professor William Engbretson carried out this analysis and drafted the summarizing statement.

power nor the funds to conduct the program as it had been represented in the proposal. In sum, programs seemed to be most effective when the director was deeply involved in the program's goals and was able both to devote sufficient time to administrative duties and to foster cooperation and respect from participants and faculty.

The frequency and urgency of these comments suggests that special consideration should be given to this key role in future studies of the ExTFP and in the organization of individual programs.

B. Some Comments on Correlational Methods

1. The Nature of the Data

To determine the relationships among variables, for every institution the arithmetic mean was computed for the judgments made by each source on the items that were of interest. This permitted institutions to be arrayed, for example, according to the average degree of satisfaction that the fellows expressed, according to the average faculty rating of effectiveness, and so on for a substantial number of variables. Product-moment correlation coefficients were then computed among these variables.

It should be obvious that two variables cannot be correlated with one another unless there is at least some variation in the scores on each from one observation to another. If all of the scores on one item fall at the identical point, then responses to that item cannot possibly co-vary with responses to some other item. On many of the items that dealt with satisfaction and effectiveness the responses of directors showed next to no variation, being largely concentrated at the most favorable alternatives. For this reason, directors' responses will not be included in the correlation matrices that are presented in this section.

There remained responses by faculty and fellows at 47 institutions, and responses by faculty, fellows, and evaluators at 31 institutions which were visited. It seemed clear that our interpretation of the results would be substantially strengthened by including a discussion of the correlations of evaluators' judgments with those made by fellows and faculty members. However, correlations based only on the 31 programs that were visited might, because they ignored 16 other institutions, give a distorted picture of the true pattern of relationships among variables. To make sure that this was not the case, two correlation matrices were computed, one based on responses by faculty and fellows in all 47 institutions, the other based on responses by faculty, fellows, and evaluators in the 31 schools that were visited. A comparison of the correlations between identical pairs of variables in the two matrices showed that very similar results were obtained. Therefore, only correlation coefficients based on the 31 programs that were visited will be used in the results that are reported below. With a set of 31 observations, a correlation of about .35 is required for the inference that it differs from zero by an amount greater than would be expected by chance.

2. Interpreting the Correlation Coefficients

When two variables show a sizeable correlation, it is often tempting and sometimes reasonable to conclude that they are somehow causally related. This temptation should be indulged with caution, if at all; causal relationships cannot be established by correlational techniques. For example, we shall see that there was a high positive correlation between fellows' morale and their judgments of program effectiveness: in programs where morale was high, fellows' judgments of effectiveness was high, when morale was low so were fellows' judgments of effectiveness. Clearly, however, this does not mean that high morale produces an effective program. It is equally likely that the causal chain goes the other way, that morale goes down when a program becomes ineffective or up as effectiveness improves. It is also plausible that the two variables interact, so that some degree of ineffectiveness depresses morale, which makes for even less effectiveness, decreasing morale still further. The point is that one should be cautious in interpreting correlations. The results that will be reported below often seem to point toward ways by which programs can be improved; we believe, in fact, that they offer suggestions for improvement. But these suggestions must be examined intelligently, not accepted uncritically as a consequence of an impressively large correlation coefficient.

A final point must be made. It has long been known that when judgments are made on several variables, all of which have a desirable and an undesirable pole, a built-in correlation is introduced. A respondent who takes a favorable or unfavorable stance with respect to some issue is likely to rate all of the subsidiary aspects of that issue in a manner consistent with his over-all position. In particular, people who are favorable to the ExTFP as a whole would probably be partial to all its parts. We have already seen evidence of such a tendency in the responses of the program directors. So a certain degree of correlation must be expected between any pair of items from the same questionnaire as a simple function of this bias. However, such a bias cannot be invoked as an explanation when items from different questionnaires correlate with one another; when two different sources agree in their ratings of an institution on some dimensions, the bias of either source alone cannot be invoked as an explanation. For this reason, special attention must be given to the correlations between judgments that were made by different sources.

C. Correlations Among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

It has already become evident that faculty members, fellows, and evaluators all showed favorable opinions of the effectiveness of the ExTFP. The question at hand is whether an institution that was ranked high on one measure also received a high ranking on another. For purposes of this presentation, measures of satisfaction and effectiveness will be combined in one correlation matrix owing to the fact, as we shall see, that the two kinds of measures had very high correlations with one another.

Table 10 presents the pattern of correlations among eight measures of effectiveness and satisfaction. It is apparent that there were consistently high positive correlations among such ratings when they were given by the same source. Thus, the average correlation among the faculty items was +.55 and the average correlation among the three fellow items was +.72. High correlations were also obtained between judgments by the fellows and those by evaluators, the average correlation being +.55. As to correlations between faculty judgments and those by the other two sources, however, only faculty ratings of whether the program met the fellows' educational needs correlated with all of the items from the other sources. In addition, faculty judgments of whether the fellows would become better teachers correlated with fellows' judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction but not with evaluators' judgments. Faculty members' own reactions to the program and their ratings of its value to the fellows did not correlate significantly with any of the ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness that fellows or evaluators made.

Table 10. Correlations among Measures of Effectiveness and Satisfaction

Source	Item	Faculty				Fellows			Ev. 19
		16	18	20a	26	23	24	31	
Faculty	16. Reaction to ExTFP	--	.43	.63	.69	.26	.31	.34	.24
	18. Did fellows become better teacher?	.43	--	.43	.62	.43	.46	.55	.14
	20a. ExTFP valuable for fellows?	.63	.43	--	.49	.02	.01	.17	.12
	26. ExTFP meet fellows' needs?	.69	.62	.49	--	.41	.58	.61	.44
Fellows	23. ExTFP meet your major need?	.26	.43	.02	.41	--	.61	.74	.40
	24. Reaction to ExTFP	.31	.46	.01	.58	.61	--	.81	.60
	31. ExTFP help your teaching?	.34	.55	.17	.61	.74	.81	--	.65
Evaluator	19. ExTFP meet fellows' needs?	.24	.14	.12	.44	.40	.60	.65	--

The fact that the fellows' judgments of effectiveness correlated with those by the evaluators and also with faculty members' estimates of whether the ExTFP met the fellows' educational needs is encouraging evidence of consistent, reliably-ascertained differences between programs in their effectiveness. Why the other faculty measures of satisfaction and effectiveness did not also correlate with the items from the fellows' and the evaluator questionnaires is not immediately clear.

D. The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Structure

Under this heading we will consider the correlations between program effectiveness and three classes of variables: (1) achievement of the en bloc approach, solidarity, and morale, (2) relations among departments and institutions, and (3) the role of the director. In each case, we first present the correlation among variables within the set, then their correlations with effectiveness.

1. The En-Bloc Approach, Solidarity, and Morale

a. Correlation among measures. We have already learned (a) that a generally high level of solidarity was achieved in all of the programs but (b) some institutions had a consistently higher level of morale than did others. Table 11 presents the correlations among the different ratings of solidarity and morale. All but one of the 10 correlation coefficients achieved statistical significance, the mean correlation being .58. There was, then, remarkable agreement between sources as to which programs were characterized by a very high degree of solidarity and morale and which were not. It should be noted that the lowest correlation in this table, .30, was between the evaluators' rating of successful achievement of the en bloc approach and the faculty rating of student morale.

Table 11. Correlations among Measures of Solidarity and Morale

Source	Item	Faculty		Fellows		Ev. 17
		48	49	47	49	
Faculty	48. Student solidarity	--	.71	.57	.68	.45
	49. Student morale	.71	--	.57	.67	.30
Fellows	47. Student solidarity	.57	.57	--	.76	.49
	49. Own morale	.68	.67	.76	--	.56
Evaluator	17. <u>En bloc</u> successful	.45	.30	.49	.56	--

b. Relation of solidarity and morale to satisfaction and effectiveness. Table 12 presents the correlations between measures of solidarity and morale and those of satisfaction and effectiveness. It is evident that the majority of these correlations were quite high, even when the ratings were obtained from different sources, except that fellow and evaluator ratings of solidarity did not correlate significantly with faculty measures of effectiveness. The average correlation of faculty ratings of solidarity with faculty

ratings of effectiveness was +.50, with fellows' ratings of effectiveness, +.46, and with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, +.47. The average correlation of fellows' ratings of solidarity with their own ratings of effectiveness was +.47, with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, +.42, and with faculty ratings of effectiveness, +.28. Finally, the evaluator rating of achievement of the en bloc approach correlated +.71 with the evaluator measure of effectiveness, had an average correlation of +.41 with fellows' measures of effectiveness, and an average correlation of only +.18 with faculty ratings of effectiveness. Whatever the causal factors that may be involved in these correlations, it is clear that the achievement of the en bloc approach and of solidarity and morale was associated with program effectiveness, especially as viewed by fellows and evaluators.

Table 12. Correlations of Solidarity and Morale with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty				Fellows			Ev. 19
		16	18	20a	26	23	24	31	
Faculty	48. Student solidarity	.43	.42	.25	.44	.35	.60	.58	.57
	49. Student morale	.62	.62	.62	.63	.22	.47	.51	.37
Fellows	47. Student solidarity	.27	.37	.22	.32	.53	.64	.55	.44
	49. Own morale	.30	.25	.22	.30	.13	.57	.41	.40
Evaluator	17. <u>En bloc</u> successful	.28	.08	.13	.21	.29	.51	.44	.71

2. Relations among Departments and Institutions.

a. Correlations among measures. Under this heading will be considered evaluator and fellow ratings of cooperation between departments, and evaluator judgments of whether the institution had established relationships with the local school systems. It will be remembered that respondents reported great variability among programs in the extent of cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education departments, and in the amount of cooperation with local school systems. Table 13 presents the correlations among the three measures of cooperation. None of these correlations is higher than +.21. This independence of one set of responses from another reveals, first, that according to evaluators' reports, whether subject-matter and teacher-education departments cooperated had no bearing upon whether cooperation was established between the institution and local school systems. Second, the low correlation means that

judgments of departmental cooperation made by fellows were either based upon different criteria from those used by evaluators or that the two groups used their criteria differently in these judgments.

Table 13. Correlations among Measures of Departmental and Institutional Cooperation

Source	Item	Fellows 38	Evaluator 3 4	
Fellows	38. Departments cooperate	--	.15	.21
Evaluator	3. Departments cooperate	.15	--	.18
	4. Coop. with local schools	.21	.18	--

b. Correlations of measures of cooperation with program effectiveness.

Despite the lack of correlation among these measures of cooperation, we see in Table 14 that both fellows' and evaluators' assessments of departmental cooperation were correlated significantly with ratings of effectiveness made by fellows and evaluators; however, they were consistently uncorrelated with faculty ratings of program effectiveness. Thus, although the fellows may have used different criteria from evaluators in judging departmental cooperation, by either criterion, programs that were rated as having a relatively high degree of cooperation among departments were more likely than not to be adjudged effective. The degree of cooperation with local school systems, as reported by evaluators, was substantially unrelated to any measures of effectiveness.

Table 14. Correlations of Departmental Cooperation with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16 18 20a 26				Fellows 23 24 31			Ev. 19
Fellows	38. Departments cooperate	.12	.21	-.11	.35	.56	.70	.60	.54
Evaluator	3. Departments cooperate	-.04	-.20	-.12	.06	.40	.32	.47	.44
	4. Coop. with local schools	-.10	-.10	-.11	.27	.14	.26	.31	.35

E. The Relationship Between Program Effectiveness and Program Strategy

The reader will recall that the general topic of program strategy subsumed ratings of the utilization of fellows' background, the amount of competitiveness and the work load, the involvement of the faculty, and the extent of innovation in the programs. The correlation of each of these variables with effectiveness will be discussed in turn.

1. Utilization of Fellows' Background

a. Correlation among measures. In their judgments of whether the program's organization took into account the extensive experience of fellows, evaluation teams were distinct from the other three groups in saying that the majority did not. Though they disagreed with the fellows in the extent to which they felt that fellows' backgrounds were utilized, the evaluation teams clearly arrayed institutions on this variable in about the same order as did the fellows, for the correlation between ratings from these two sources was +.45. This correlation, in fact, was the largest correlation in the matrix (Table 15); the only other significant correlation is that between fellows' judgments on this variable and faculty statements that the program was modified to take advantage of fellows' experience.

Table 15. Correlations among Measures of Whether the Programs Utilized Fellows' Backgrounds

Source	Item	Faculty		Fellows	Ev.
		45	46	42	16
Faculty	45. Effort to use experience	--	.06	.05	.22
	46. Modify prog. for experience	.06	--	.38	.07
Fellows	42. Build on experience	.05	.38	--	.45
Evaluator	16. Take acct. of experience	.22	.07	.45	--

b. Correlations of utilization of participants' backgrounds with program effectiveness and solidarity. As is shown in Table 16, faculty judgments of whether the program utilized fellows' experiences were not significantly related to any measure of effectiveness; faculty statements that the program was modified to take advantage of the fellows' experience were generally related to the faculty's own estimates of effectiveness,

but not to those by fellows and by evaluators. On the other hand, evaluators' and fellows' judgments on this same measure were significantly related to every fellow and evaluator measure of effectiveness and also to faculty judgments that the program met the educational needs of the fellows. We may conclude, then, that the programs whose organization built best on the backgrounds of the fellows according to the interpretation of the evaluators and the fellows (and we do not know the criteria on which these sources based their interpretations) were also adjudged to be more effective.

Table 16. Correlations of Utilization of Participants' Backgrounds and Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty				Fellows			Ev. 19
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31	
Faculty	45. Effort to use exp.	-.19	.04	-.13	-.25	-.22	-.06	-.10	.06
	46. Modify prog. for exp.	.54	.31	.53	.27	.12	.21	.23	.05
Fellows	42. Build on experience	.27	.16	.51	.53	.48	.71	.76	.47
Evaluator	16. Take acct. of exp.	.16	.04	.44	.03	.34	.60	.60	.71

2. Competitiveness and Work Load

a. Correlations among measures. The correlations reported in Table 17 lend empirical support to our earlier conclusion that the faculty judgments about student work load represented a positive statement about the fellows, not an objective assessment of the amount of work they were required to do: every correlation of the faculty judgments on this item with those of fellows or evaluators was negative. On the other hand, fellows' judgments of their work load correlated positively and significantly with those of the evaluators. It should be noted, in addition, that neither of these last two measures -- fellows' and evaluators' estimates of the work load -- correlated significantly with fellows' statements about the level of competitiveness in their programs; clearly, fellows could believe they were overworked in either a competitive or a non-competitive atmosphere.

Table 17. Correlations among Measures of Competitiveness and Work Load

Source	Item	Faculty 35	Fellows 26 29	Ev. 14
Faculty	35. Did students work hard	--	-.39 .31	-.26
Fellows	26. Work Load	-.39	-- .28	.54
	29. Level of competition	-.31	.28 --	.01
Evaluator	14. Work Load	-.26	.54 .01	--

b. Relationship of competitiveness and work load to program effectiveness.

Further evidence for our conclusion that faculty ratings of the amount of work the fellows did actually represent favorable judgments of their performance is given in row 1 of Table 18. This measure correlated positively and significantly with every faculty rating of program effectiveness and with two of the three effectiveness ratings made by fellows.

A different pattern held for fellows' ratings of their work load. These judgments showed a high negative correlation with fellows' opinions that the program was stimulating and interesting, and moderate negative correlations with the other ratings of program effectiveness by the fellows and evaluators as well as with faculty judgments of whether the program produced better teachers. Evaluator ratings of work load also showed negative correlations with fellow and evaluator ratings of effectiveness. As to the level of competitiveness in the program, while the correlations of this measure with judgments of effectiveness and satisfaction were consistently negative, they barely achieved statistical significance in only two cases. In short, programs in which fellows and evaluators reported that the work load was excessive tended also to be programs which received low marks for effectiveness and satisfaction, but a program that was viewed as competitive was not necessarily ineffective.

Table 18. Correlations of Competitiveness and Work Load with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Faculty 16 20a 26 18				Fellows 23 24 31			Ev. 19
Faculty	35. Work hard?	.49	.41	.63	.62	.22	.51	.46	.24
Fellows	26. Fellows' work load	-.34	.03	-.21	-.43	-.35	-.72	-.30	-.32
	29. Competitiveness	-.17	-.28	-.24	-.39	.01	-.39	-.30	.04
Evaluator	14. Fellows' work load	-.26	.08	-.30	-.26	-.24	-.44	-.35	-.38

3. Involvement of the Faculty

a. Correlations among measures. There were five items that bore on the faculty's involvement in the ExTFP: two of these asked the faculty whether the ExTFP had been challenging and satisfying, one asked evaluators if the faculty had been challenged and stimulated by the ExTFP, and two asked fellows whether the faculty had been accessible and helpful. The correlations among these measures, presented in Table 19 show that almost the only significant correlations are between measures from the same questionnaire. Thus, institutes in which the faculty said they were challenged were also those in which the faculty found the teaching satisfying; schools in which fellows reported the faculty were accessible were schools in which fellows said the faculty were helpful. The only significant correlation between items from different questionnaires was between fellows' reports of faculty helpfulness and evaluator ratings of faculty stimulation.

Table 19. Correlations among Measures of Faculty Involvement

Source	Item	Faculty		Fellows		Ev. 9a
		24	25	41a	41b	
Faculty	24. Was teaching challenging?	--	.56	.19	.30	.33
	25. Was teaching satisfying?	.56	--	.10	.28	.14
Fellows	41a. Were faculty accessible?	.19	.10	--	.87	.24
	41b. Were faculty helpful?	.30	.28	.87	--	.41
Evaluator	9a. Was staff challenged?	.33	.14	.24	.41	--

b. Correlations between faculty involvement and effectiveness. The pattern of correlations between faculty involvement and effectiveness, presented in Table 20, is not easy to understand. One of the faculty measures, statements about whether the teaching experience was satisfying, correlated with virtually every measure of effectiveness and satisfaction -- perhaps because it might, itself, be called a measure of satisfaction. Evaluators' judgments of whether the faculty was challenged were correlated with fellow and evaluator, but not faculty, measures of effectiveness. Fellow ratings of the faculty's helpfulness and accessibility correlated significantly only with their own judgments of effectiveness.

Table 20. Correlations of Faculty Involvement with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Program Effectiveness							
		Faculty				Fellows			Ev.
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31	19
Faculty	24. Teaching chall.	.42	.09	.31	.28	.26	.25	.26	.18
	25. Teaching satisf.	.75	.27	.55	.46	.31	.45	.50	.30
Fellows	41a. Fac. accessible	-.01	-.25	-.01	.23	.58	.40	.29	.15
	41b. Fac. helpful	.14	-.11	.23	.38	.65	.66	.49	.32
Evaluator	9a. Fac. challenged	.16	.01	.24	.08	.44	.51	.45	.68

4. Innovativeness

As we have seen, on the two measures of innovativeness, neither faculty members nor evaluators reported any appreciable degree of innovation. Nor did measures of innovation from the two sources vary jointly: the correlation between them was .10.

On the other hand, as may be seen in Table 21, the faculty estimate of innovativeness was related to every measure of program effectiveness; the average correlation of this variable with faculty ratings of effectiveness was .55, with fellow ratings of effectiveness, .48, and with the evaluator rating of effectiveness, .38 (Table 21). Evaluator ratings of innovativeness, on the other hand, were significantly related only to the evaluator measure of effectiveness and to faculty judgments of whether the fellows became better teachers as a result of their experience. We see, then, that by the evaluators' standards of innovation, our earlier generalization holds up: programs could be effective whether they were extensively innovative or substantially traditional. It should be noted that this question asked faculty members whether they had observed innovative teaching methods or practices; in view of this wording, their judgments may have reflected inventiveness in some one teacher's performance rather than innovativeness in the over-all program. If so, the meaning of this variable's correlations with effectiveness is considerably different from the meaning that would be carried by a correlation with innovativeness in the program itself.

An alternative explanation of the correlation between these faculty ratings and effectiveness is that the current popular emphasis on innovation in education has served to make "quality" and "innovation" in some respects synonymous for many people. Thus many faculty members may have felt that if they judged their program to be successful, it must have been innovative, as well.

Table 21. Correlations of Innovativeness with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Effectiveness						
		Faculty				Fellows		
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31
Faculty	27. Innovativeness	.59	.41	.79	.48	.50	.42	.53
Evaluator	2. Innovativeness	.11	.18	.01	.46	-.14	.03	--

5. Effects on institutional development

a. Correlations among measures. We have seen above that the three sources differed remarkably in their estimates of the Program's effect on institutional development. As might be expected, the pattern of correlations between variables showed the same lack of correspondence (Table 22): estimates by faculty members of the Program's value to the institution were uncorrelated with evaluators' ratings of both effects on teacher training and effects on departmental development. At the same time, the high correlation between the two evaluators' judgments shows that institutions at which evaluators felt changes were made in methods of teacher education also were judged to be institutions where departmental development was affected. This relationship, actually is partly determined by the fact that the "department" whose development was being affected; that is, the home department of the program, was in half the cases the department of education.

Table 22. Correlations among Measures of Effects on Institutional Development

Source	Item	Faculty	Evaluator	
		20c	1	8
Faculty	20c. Value to institution	--	.16	.07
Evaluator	1. Effects on teacher training	.16	--	.56
	8. Effects on department development	.07	.56	--

b. Correlations between institutional development and effectiveness. Table 23 presents the correlations between measures of institutional development and judgments of satisfaction and effectiveness. Global judgments by faculty members of the Program's value to the institution correlated positively with their own ratings of satisfaction and of

program effectiveness, but were only minimally related to such ratings by other sources. Evaluator judgments of the Program's effects upon the host institution showed low positive relationships to their own and fellows' ratings of effectiveness, but were unrelated to such ratings by faculty members. In short, it appears that a program could be effective in training students without, necessarily, serving as the impetus for extensive changes in the pattern or organization at the host institution.

Table 23. Correlations of Effects on Institutional Development with Program Effectiveness

Source	Item	Measures of Program Effectiveness						
		Faculty				Fellows		
		16	20a	26	18	23	24	31
Faculty	20c. Value to insti.	.70	.47	.47	.63	.07	.41	.35
Evaluator	1. Effects on teacher tr.	.04	.10	.10	.20	.29	.44	.37
	8. Effects on dept. div.	.14	.03	.07	.22	.14	.27	.31
								.19

E. Summary: Correlates of Effectiveness

Detailed comments should be made about two aspects of these results. The first has to do with the reliability of judgments, with whether two judgments which seem, on the surface, to be asking the same question do, in fact, correlate with one another; the second is the consistent correlates of satisfaction and effectiveness.

1. The reliability of the judgments

In general, when a single source was asked more than one question on the same topic or logically related ones, the responses to those questions were positively correlated. Thus, faculty, fellow, or evaluator responses to one item showed generally high correlations with responses by the same source to other items whose content was similar. For example, institutions whose faculty members said the Program was stimulating and interesting throughout were also the ones whose faculty said that the Program was of great value to the fellows, that it helped the fellows become better teachers, and that it met fellows' educational needs.

However, responses by different sources to items that were similar in content did not always correlate significantly. Two sets of items -- satisfaction and effectiveness, and solidarity and morale -- showed marked consistency across all three sources; for each set of items, the ratings that institutions received from faculty members paralleled those given by fellows and also, to a lesser extent, those given by evaluation teams. On a number of other factors, responses by faculty members were substantially uncorrelated with those of

fellows and of evaluators. However, the responses of fellows and those of evaluation teams correlated virtually across the board -- in ratings of satisfaction and effectiveness, of solidarity and morale, of fellows' work load, of whether the fellows' experience was utilized, and of the extent of faculty involvement in the Program, responses from these two sources correlated significantly; only in judgments of whether there was cooperation between different departments were fellows' judgments and those by evaluators uncorrelated. For one set of items -- estimates of fellows' work load -- faculty judgments were inversely related to those from the other two sources, probably because the question that was asked of faculty members evoked judgments of the level of fellows' motivation instead of objective assessments of their work load. In short, there was consistently high agreement between judgments by fellows and those by evaluation teams; agreement between these two sources and the faculty was largely restricted to two areas: (a) satisfaction and effectiveness and (b) solidarity and morale.

It is interesting to speculate about the meaning of this differential pattern of correlations. Since the three sources viewed the program from different perspectives, the pattern of correlations probably reflects such differences. It might be argued, first of all, that whether a program was very effective or relatively ineffective, and whether its fellows had very high or relatively low morale could be determined by faculty and fellows alike from evidence that is public and common. People discuss with one another how much they have learned and how well it was presented; there are indicators of group solidarity and morale which almost any adult can see and identify. On the other hand, more subjective criteria are called into play for judging whether and how much the fellows' prior experience was utilized by the program, or how deeply the faculty was involved in the program. Such questions are probably less frequently discussed, the bases for decision about them less commonly shared, than the topics of effectiveness or group solidarity. If this is true, judgments on these latter topics would be more likely to reflect the biasing effect of the judge's social position. To be more specific, it seems likely that the faculty's institutional position made it unlikely that they would learn much about the fellows' past experience and its relevance to the course material, or about fellows' judgments of whether the faculty was involved in the program. In the absence of explicit information, the faculty was doubtless likely to respond in a manner consistent with their desire that their own program be rated effective and "good."

These considerations would account for the lack of correlation between responses of fellows and faculty on issues of this second type, but not necessarily for the fact that judgments of evaluators paralleled those of the fellows instead of the faculty when the latter sources disagreed. Perhaps their discussions with the fellows exposed evaluation teams to information that was not available to the faculty; alternatively, perhaps evaluators considered the faculty to be more personally involved than fellows in the outcome of the evaluation, hence more likely to be biased in their judgments.

Whether one of these explanations or some other one can account for the results, of course, requires information that is not available in the present study. Concerning the reliability of judgments, we have seen that judgments made by a single source on a single issue were quite reliable, that consistent positive correlations were found between the three different sources in their judgments of effectiveness and of morale, and that evaluation teams and fellows consistently agreed with each other, but not with the faculty, on other issues.

2. Correlates of satisfaction and effectiveness

Programs that ranked high on satisfaction and rated effectiveness (a) were adjudged by faculty and by fellows to have a high degree of solidarity and morale, and by evaluation teams to have been successful in achieving esprit de corps through the en bloc approach; (b) were successful in the view of fellows and of evaluators in utilizing the previous experience of the fellows; and (c) were adjudged by fellows and evaluators not to have required an altogether unrealistic amount of work.

The fact that effectiveness and morale went together is not surprising; it reaffirms a long standing common-sense generalization. It is interesting to note, however, that effectiveness was correlated only with judgments by fellows and evaluators of whether the fellows' backgrounds were utilized and of work load; judgments by faculty members on the last two issues did not correlate with the same judgments by the other two sources. This suggests that the faculty and directors may often have been uninformed of the fellows' attitudes on these and other issues; indeed, spontaneous comments by evaluation teams suggested that such was often the case. This, in turn, has implications for the conduct of programs in institutions where the fellows thought that their work load was much too heavy, or that they were too seldom able to contribute from their own knowledge and experience to the educational program, and where the faculty and director were unaware of these attitudes. It seems likely that information about fellows' attitudes might have induced the staff of the programs either to change some part of their educational structure and content so as to meet the fellows' objections, or to clarify for fellows and staff alike the reasons for retaining an existing system. These actions, in turn, would likely have made such programs more enjoyable and effective. The obvious suggestion, then, is that some programs might have been much more effective if the fellows' views on sensitive issues had been more effectively communicated to the faculty and the director. Clearly, the primary responsibility for ensuring that such communication takes place rests with the director and his staff, not with the fellows.

Although fellows and evaluators did not agree as to which programs had a great deal of cooperation among departments and which did not, by either the evaluators' or the fellows' criterion, programs with such cooperation were more effective than those without it. Similarly, although faculty members and evaluators did not agree as to which host institutions benefitted most from the Program, those institutions that either group judged to have benefitted most were rated as most effective. Two other kinds of questions showed inconsistent patterns of relationships with satisfaction and effectiveness. Ratings by each source of the extent of faculty involvement in the program were correlated with effectiveness as rated by that source but not as rated by the other sources.

Finally, there was a significant correlation between faculty ratings of innovativeness and every measure of effectiveness -- institutions whose faculties were impressed with the innovations that had been introduced through the Program were considered to be relatively effective by faculty, fellows, and evaluators alike; however, evaluator ratings of innovativeness were only marginally correlated with effectiveness as judged by evaluators and were uncorrelated with such judgments by the other two sources. We have suggested that faculty ratings of innovativeness may have reflected their own involvement in the program more than objective judgments of this phenomenon.

We have already remarked that one should not infer causation from correlation. Hopefully, future studies in this series will help further to clarify the factors that account for differences among institutions. Our caveat against confusing correlation with causation, however, does not apply to the relationship between the director's behavior and program effectiveness. The experience of the evaluation teams strongly suggested that an energetic, persuasive director with institutional power commensurate to his responsibilities could play a major role in assuring the effectiveness of the program. Conversely, a promising program was sometimes rendered less effective by an inept director, one with insufficient time to give to his duties, or one denied the power to institute and carry through both general policies and the specific procedures necessary to implement those policies.

Appendix A. Experimental Teacher Fellowship Programs, 1966-67

Subject	Institution	Grade Level	Director
Geography	Ohio State University	7-12	Dr. Robert E. Jewett
Geography	Oregon College of Education	7-12	Dr. Paul F. Griffin
History	Carnegie Institute of Technology	Secondary	Dr. Richard B. Ford
History	Illinois State University	10-12	Dr. Fred W. Kohlmeyer
History	University of Kansas	7-12	Dr. Ambrose Saricks
History	University of Virginia	7-12	Dr. Paul Edward Kelly
Social Studies	University of Minnesota ¹	9-12	Dr. Fred E. Lukerman
Social Studies	Oregon State University	7-12	Dr. Hans H. Plambeck
Social Studies	Purdue University	K-12	Dr. Jay W. Wiley
Social Studies	Syracuse University	Secondary	Dr. Roy A. Price
English	Chico State College	K-9	Dr. John Fisher
English	University of Illinois	7-12	Dr. J. N. Hook
English	University of Nebraska	K-12	Dr. Frank M. Rice
English	San Fernando Valley State College	7-12	Dr. Daniel Bernd
Math and Science	Earlham College	Secondary	Dr. Stuart Whitcomb
Math and Science	Earlham College	Secondary	Dr. Daniel Smith
Math and Science	Florida State University	K-6	Dr. Eugene D. Nichols

¹Questionnaires from fellows were not received from the program at the University of Minnesota.

Subject	Institution	Grade Level	Director
Math and Science	Michigan State University	4-6	Dr. F. B. Dutton
Math and Science	University of Minnesota	Elementary	Dr. Robert L. Heller
Math and Science	Sam Houston State College	1-6	Dr. Everett D. Wilson
Reading	Clarke College	1-8	Sister Mary Edward
Reading	University of Hawaii	1-12	Dr. Richard S. Alm
Reading	Indiana University	K-6	Dr. Ronald C. Welch
Reading	Sonoma State College	1-8	Dr. Herbert Fougner
Modern Foreign Languages	Indiana University	9-12	Dr. Edward W. Najam
Modern Foreign Languages	University of Washington	Secondary	Dr. Richard F. Wilkie
Modern Foreign Languages	University of Wisconsin	K-12	Dr. Theodore E. Rose
Art and Music	Arizona State University	9-12	Dr. Bill J. Fullerton
Art and Music	University of Michigan	Secondary	Dr. Emil A. Holz
Elementary Education	Fisk University	1-6	Dr. George N. Redd
Elementary Education	Hofstra University	1-6	Dr. Harold Morine
Elementary Education	University of Missouri	K-6	Dr. Gary W. Nahrstedt
Elementary Education	Stanford University	K-8	Dr. G. Wesley Sowards

Subject	Institution	Grade Level	Director
Elementary Education	Teachers College	Pre-Kindergarten & K	Dr. Helen F. Robison
Teaching of the Disadvantaged	University of Alaska	1-8	Dr. Charles K. Ray
Teaching of the Disadvantaged	Illinois Teachers College Chicago North	1-8	Dr. Donald H. Smith
Teaching of the Disadvantaged	Temple University	5-8	Dr. Thomas B. Stone
Teaching of the Disadvantaged	Texas Western College	1-6	Dr. Marion Cline, Jr.
Counseling and Guidance	University of Maryland	K-8	Dr. David Rhodes
Counseling and Guidance	University of Michigan	K-12	Dr. Garry R. Walz
Counseling and Guidance	University of Missouri	1-8	Dr. Bob G. Woods
Counseling and Guidance	University of Rochester	K-6	Dr. Harold L. Munson
Educational Media	Chapman College	K-12	Dr. Robert E. Corrigan
Educational Media	Syracuse University	K-12	Dr. Eugene K. Oxhandler
School Library	Columbia University	7-9	Dr. Frances Henne
School Library	Wayne State University	K-12	Dr. Margaret Hayes Grazier

Subject	Institution	Grade Level	Director
English as a Foreign Language	New York University	7-12	Dr. Joseph H. Sheehan
Administration	University of Southwestern Louisiana	K-12	Dr. James R. Oliver
Physical Education for Handicapped	Colorado State College	K-12	Dr. Vincent A. Cyphers
Health Education	University of Oregon	Secondary	Dr. Arthur A. Esslinger
School Psychology	Rutgers University	K-12	Dr. Jack I. Bardon

Appendix B. Responses to Participant Questionnaire¹

1. How old were you as of your last birthday?

28.2	20-29 years
51.1	30-39 years
16.1	40-49 years
3.9	50-59 years
.1	60 and over
.6	No response

2. Your sex

51.3	Male
48.5	Female
.3	No response

3. In what type school or school system did you work last year?

94.2	Public
3.5	Private, denominational
1.1	Private, nonsectarian
1.1	Other (please specify) _____
.2	No response

4. At which of the following school levels were you principally involved?

2.6	Preschool and kindergarten
42.3	Elementary school
20.9	Junior high school
32.4	High school
1.7	None of these (please specify) _____
.2	No response

5. What was the enrollment of your school last year?

3.7	Under 200
11.5	200-400
18.2	401-600
21.5	601-900
16.1	901-1,200
17.0	1,201-2,000
8.7	Over 2,000
3.1	I am not in one school
.2	No response

¹The percent of responses that fell in each category is given in the blanks to the left of the alternatives. Percentages are based on a total of 930 respondents from 49 different programs.

6. In what kind of community was your school or school system located?

18.6	In a very large city of over 500,000 population
9.4	In a large city between 200,000 and 500,000 population
14.3	In a suburb or "satellite" city of a central city with a population of 200,000 or more
7.2	In a medium-sized city between 100,000 and 200,000 population
17.2	In a small city between 25,000 and 100,000 population
22.8	In a town or city between 2,500 and 25,000 population
9.9	In a small town or open county
.5	No response

7. In what section of the country was your school or school system located?

23.2	Northeast: New England and N.Y., N.J., Pa., Md., Del., D. C.
6.9	Southeast: Va., W. Va., N. C., S. C., Ga., Fla.
4.9	South central: Ky., Tenn., Ala., Miss., La., Ark.
7.2	Southwest: Tex., Okla., Ariz., N. Mexico
32.6	Midwest: Ohio, Mich., Ind., Ill., Wisc., Minn., Mo., Iowa, Nebr., Kans., N. Dak., S. Dak.
24.3	West: Colo., Mont., Idaho, Nev., Utah, Wyo., Cal., Oregon, Wash., Alaska, Hawaii
.9	Outside of the 50 states

8. Concerning the social and economic backgrounds of the students in the school or school system where you taught last year

(a) What proportion would you estimate came from well-to-do families?

64.7	Less than 10%
25.4	Between 10% and 35%
5.7	Between 35% and 65%
2.9	Between 65% and 90%
1.2	Over 90%
.4	No response

(b) What proportion would you estimate came from families of middle income?

12.5	Less than 10%
24.9	Between 10% and 35%
43.3	Between 35% and 65%
18.2	Between 65% and 90%
.6	Over 90%
.4	No response

(c) What proportion would you estimate came from families in which the income is low but steady?

26.5	Less than 10%
46.7	Between 10% and 35%
19.8	Between 35% and 65%
5.9	Between 65% and 90%
.5	Over 90%
.6	No response

(d) What proportion would you estimate came from families marked by frequent unemployment or even poverty?

66.3	Less than 10%
19.4	Between 10% and 35%
6.7	Between 35% and 65%
5.7	Between 65% and 90%
1.2	Over 90%
.7	No response

9. Concerning the ethnic background of the students where you taught, were they

68.5	All or mostly white
3.8	All or mostly Spanish-speaking
.3	All or mostly Indian
11.7	All or mostly Negro
7.6	A more or less even combination of two of these (Please specify which ones) _____
2.5	A more or less even combination of three of these (Please specify which ones) _____
5.2	Others (Please specify) _____
.4	No response

10. As to your own educational background, how many hours of undergraduate credit did you take in the special subject that your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program deals with?

37.4	Less than 10 hours
19.2	10-20 hours
14.6	20-30 hours
11.2	30-40 hours
17.0	Over 40 hours
.5	No response

11. How many hours of graduate credit had you taken in the subject prior to entering the program?

34.2	None
35.7	1 to 10
18.2	11-20
6.3	21-30
5.4	31 or more
.2	No response

12. How many years have you worked in the field of education?

8.4	Less than 3
32.8	3 to 5
34.6	6 to 10
20.7	11-20
1.9	21-25
1.4	26 or more

13. What is the subject matter of your Program _____.

14. For how many years have you worked as a specialist in the subject you are studying this year?

60.8	Less than 3
25.2	6 to 10
5.9	11-15
.8	16 to 20
.3	21 to 25
.2	26 or more
6.9	No response

15. In the position you held last year, did you work principally in educational administration?

3.0	Yes
21.5	No, but I had some administrative duties
75.4	No, I had no special administrative duties
.1	No response

16. If your answer to question 15 was "Yes", do you plan to remain in educational administration?

2.0	Definitely yes
4.3	Probably yes
3.1	Probably no
3.5	Definitely no
86.7	No response

17. If your answer to question 15 was "No", do you expect someday to go into full-time educational administration?

5.8	Definitely yes
32.7	Probably yes
41.9	Probably no
14.0	Definitely no
5.5	No response

18. How many NDEA summer institutes or other training programs lasting four weeks or longer have you attended?

65.7	None
24.6	One
6.3	Two
2.5	Three
.9	Four or more

19. How clear was your understanding of the objectives of the program before you entered it?

31.6	Very clear
48.6	Pretty clear
15.6	Not very clear
4.0	Not clear at all
.2	No response

20. Before you enrolled in the Program, what topics and/or techniques did you expect it to emphasize? _____

21. How closely did the content and emphasis of the Program coincide with your expectations?

26.0	Very closely
46.1	Moderately closely
24.8	Not too closely
2.5	Not at all
.5	No response

22. Check the one teaching problem that concerned you most before you enrolled in the Program.

16.1	Motivating students
12.4	Handling students of low ability
5.0	Encouraging and stimulating gifted students
20.2	Knowledge of the subject matter
13.7	Determining what is most important to teaching
22.6	Using effective teaching methods
9.2	Knowledge of appropriate materials

23. To what extent did the Program this year meet that problem?

34.7 To a great degree
38.7 To a moderate degree
20.6 To a slight degree
6.0 Not at all

24. Which of the following alternatives best describe your reaction to the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

32.0 It was a stimulating and interesting experience throughout
50.4 It was usually stimulating and interesting
16.4 It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting
1.2 It was seldom or never stimulating and interesting

25. In terms of your own interests, experiences, and job responsibilities, how realistic and useful were the objectives of the Program you attended?

11.7 Exceptionally realistic
38.1 Very realistic
36.3 Fairly realistic
12.4 Not too realistic
1.5 Not realistic at all

26. What is your opinion of the schedule and work load of the Program?

46.8 Too heavy to allow completion of assignments and independent work
51.6 About right
.6 Too light
1.0 No response

Please comment _____

27. Please describe briefly the evaluation system used in your program (grades, pass-fail, etc.)

28. Please circle all adjectives which describe adequately the system used to evaluate your work as a student during the past year.

Careful
Unfortunate
Reasonable
Demeaning
Meaningful
Systematic

Useless
Helpful
Fair
Biased
Useful
Unfair
Usual

29. Did you find a high level of competition for grades, prestige, recognition among students?

27.4	Extremely high level
33.3	Quite high level
30.8	About right
5.1	Quite a low level
2.6	Very low level
.9	No response

Please comment _____

30. How did you react to the level of competition? _____

31. How useful has the Program been in preparing you to handle your own teaching situations and your own students?

41.7	Extremely useful
37.1	Moderately useful
17.9	Somewhat useful
2.7	Not useful at all
.6	No response

32. Assuming you can make any changes you wish, state in one or two sentences what things you think ought to be changed in the way your subject is handled in the school you taught in last year _____

33. Were your opinions of the way your subject should be handled in the school influenced by your experience in the Program?

35.6	A great deal
34.1	Quite a bit
22.8	Somewhat
5.8	Not at all
1.7	No response

In addition to checking one of the above alternatives, please comment, if you wish _____

34. How would you rate each of the following components of the Program in terms of its contribution to your knowledge and understanding of the subject matter? (Check the appropriate blank after each component)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Was Not Provided	No Response
(a) Lectures, in general	25.2	47.3	21.0	3.9	1.7	1.0
(b) Seminars and structured discussions	17.7	40.0	25.9	1.1	14.3	.5
(c) Laboratories or workshops	16.0	27.1	18.6	8.3	26.9	3.2
(d) Instruction in use of textbooks, audio-visual materials, etc.	12.4	28.2	21.0	12.8	24.3	1.4
(e) Field trips	16.1	24.3	17.6	7.8	31.4	2.7

35. How would you rate the same components in terms of their probable contribution to your effectiveness in your job next year?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Was Not Provided	No Response
(a) Lectures, in general	21.3	44.8	22.9	7.5	1.4	2.0
(b) Seminars and structured discussions	20.4	38.6	23.3	11.3	4.1	2.6
(c) Laboratories or workshops	18.0	27.9	17.1	8.0	24.0	5.2
(d) Instruction in use of textbooks, audio-visual materials, etc.	16.8	28.3	19.8	10.2	21.3	3.7
(e) Field trips	15.1	24.8	16.7	10.1	28.3	5.1

36. How would you rate the general quality of teaching or supervision you have experienced this year in each of these components?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Was Not Provided	No Response
(a) Lectures, in general	26.6	42.7	21.6	6.9	.4	.9
(b) Seminars and structured discussions	19.8	36.6	24.1	14.0	4.5	1.1
(c) Laboratories or workshops	15.9	24.5	19.9	9.7	25.9	4.1
(d) Instruction in use of textbooks, audio-visual materials, etc.	11.2	28.8	20.2	13.0	23.8	3.0
(e) Field trips	15.4	21.8	17.3	9.4	31.5	4.7

37. How well would you say that the different components of your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program -- lecture courses, seminars, instruction in media and methods, laboratories or workshops, and field trips -- were coordinated and related to one another?

16.5	Exceptionally well coordinated and related
45.3	Usually coordinated and related, but sometimes not
28.4	Sometimes correlated and related, but usually not
9.2	Seldom or never coordinated and related
.6	No response

38. If your Program involved instruction in more than one academic department, how well was the material in one department coordinated to that in another?

7.8 Extremely well
34.5 Quite well
27.6 Not too well
14.5 Not well at all
11.8 Inapplicable to my Program
3.7 No response

39. How about the relative emphasis on subject matter and on methods of teaching?

28.2 There was too much emphasis on subject matter
64.3 There was a satisfactory balance between consideration of subject matter and of teaching methods
3.2 There was too much emphasis on teaching methods
4.3 No response

40. The following statements describe possible reactions to the courses that were offered. Examine each statement and say whether it was usually, sometimes, seldom, or never true by checking the appropriate blank.

	Usually True	Sometimes True	Seldom True	Never True	No Response
(a) The Program was largely directed to graduate students seeking advanced degrees	<u>58.5</u>	<u>25.2</u>	<u>9.9</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>1.6</u>
(b) The Program was largely directed to the problems of school teachers	<u>33.2</u>	<u>43.4</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>1.2</u>
(c) The lectures were over my head	<u>1.4</u>	<u>23.8</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>33.0</u>	<u>2.9</u>
(d) Instructors "talked down" to participants in the ExTFP courses	<u>3.2</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>30.3</u>	<u>43.3</u>	<u>2.7</u>
(e) The lectures acquainted me with various approaches to the subject	<u>49.6</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>.8</u>
(f) The lectures were too filled with details or unrelated facts	<u>4.4</u>	<u>36.5</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>11.5</u>	<u>1.3</u>
(g) The staff had little or no knowledge of the practical problems of school teachers	<u>13.3</u>	<u>38.0</u>	<u>31.6</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>1.1</u>

41. How would you describe the staff members of your Program

(a) As to their accessibility

32.5 Always accessible
61.5 Usually accessible
5.7 Seldom accessible
.1 Never accessible
.2 No response

(b) As to their helpfulness

<u>44.2</u>	Always helpful
<u>50.7</u>	Usually helpful
<u>4.6</u>	Seldom helpful
<u>.2</u>	Never helpful
<u>.3</u>	No response

42. Did the Program build on the participants' backgrounds, or did it seem to give no consideration to their backgrounds?

<u>15.5</u>	Consistently built on participants' backgrounds
<u>47.6</u>	Usually built on participants' backgrounds
<u>23.8</u>	Only rarely built on participants' backgrounds
<u>12.5</u>	Seemed to be unconcerned for participants' backgrounds
<u>.6</u>	No response

43. Give your evaluation of the administration of various aspects of the Program you participated in by checking the appropriate blank after each aspect.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Not Provided	No Response
(a) Living accommodations	<u>20.3</u>	<u>23.2</u>	<u>8.4</u>	<u>2.7</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>34.4</u>	<u>9.2</u>
(b) Classroom facilities and equipment	<u>25.7</u>	<u>43.9</u>	<u>22.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.4</u>
(c) Library	<u>36.0</u>	<u>35.4</u>	<u>17.4</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>.6</u>
(d) Individual study area	<u>21.6</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>17.6</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>1.8</u>
(e) Payment of stipends	<u>75.1</u>	<u>19.9</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>.5</u>	<u>.4</u>	<u>.0</u>	<u>.9</u>

Please comment if you wish _____

44. How do you feel about the number of participants in the Program?

<u>1.8</u>	There were too many
<u>95.2</u>	There were about the right number
<u>2.8</u>	There were too few
<u>.2</u>	No response

45. How would you rate the general level of ability of participants in the Program at your Institution?

<u>33.0</u>	Outstanding
<u>50.4</u>	High, but not outstanding
<u>15.3</u>	About average
<u>.8</u>	Somewhat lower than average
<u>.1</u>	Very low
<u>.4</u>	No response

46. Did the participants seem genuinely interested in the subject matter of the Program?

48.0	Definitely yes
46.8	For the most part, yes
4.8	For the most part, no
.0	Almost completely not
.3	No response

47. Was there a feeling of group solidarity among participants in the Program?

46.3	Yes, there was a strong feeling of group solidarity
37.8	There was considerable feeling of group solidarity
14.4	There was some, but not much, feeling of solidarity
1.2	There was no feeling of solidarity at all
.3	No response

48. How would you rate the overall morale of the participants?

22.0	Very high
38.5	Pretty high
26.8	About average
10.3	Pretty low
1.3	Very low
1.1	No response

49. How would you rate your own morale?

30.2	Very high
36.0	Pretty high
23.9	About average
7.4	Pretty low
1.6	Very low
.9	No response

50. In addition to your Program was there a regular graduate school program in your subject at the institution where you studied?

84.3	Yes
14.6	No
1.1	No response

If yes,

(a) How large was this graduate program compared to the size of the ExTFP group?

37.4	Large
27.8	Moderate in size
14.4	Small
20.3	No response

(b) How distinct was the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program from the regular graduate program?

28.0	Clearly distinct in all aspects
42.2	Distinct, but merged in some respects
17.7	Merged in most respects, but somewhat distinct
3.4	Altogether merged with the graduate program
8.7	No response

(c) For the most part, what kinds of relationships existed between ExTFP participants and regular graduate students?

25.6	Extremely cordial
20.3	Friendly, but not cordial
38.0	Largely impersonal, but not unfriendly
2.7	Somewhat distant and unfriendly
.3	Quite unfriendly
13.1	No response

(d) How would you characterize the attitude of the typical graduate student toward the ExTFP participants?

3.4	Very superior and condescending
11.2	Somewhat condescending
59.9	Generally equalitarian
8.4	Somewhat deferent
.8	Very deferent
16.3	No response

51. Based on your own experience, how would your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program compare, in overall effectiveness, with a typical eight-week, full-time summer institute in your subject?

63.5	ExTFP far superior to summer institute
13.0	ExTFP somewhat superior
5.1	The two programs would be about equally effective
2.8	Summer institute somewhat superior
1.4	Summer institute far superior
14.2	No response

Please comment if you wish _____

E. GENERAL COMMENTS

Only a few aspects of your experience as an ExTFP participant can be examined in a questionnaire of this sort. Therefore, in the space below we welcome your individual comments on the Program and its effects upon you and your colleagues.

Appendix C. Responses to Faculty Questionnaire¹

1. How old were you as of your last birthday?

<u>7.5</u>	20-29 years
<u>38.5</u>	30-39 years
<u>34.8</u>	40-49 years
<u>15.0</u>	50-59 years
<u>4.3</u>	60 and over

2. Your sex

<u>75.9</u>	Male
<u>24.1</u>	Female

3. Please check your last earned degree

<u>3.2</u>	A.B.
<u>19.3</u>	M.A.
<u>54.5</u>	Ph.D.
<u>18.2</u>	Ed.D.
<u>.0</u>	D. Sci.
<u>4.8</u>	Other (please list) _____

4. Please list your field of specialization in undergraduate and graduate school and any post-doctoral training you have had.

Undergraduate _____
 Graduate _____
 Post Doctoral _____

5. How many years have you taught full time at the college level?

<u>19.3</u>	1-2
<u>19.8</u>	3-5
<u>19.8</u>	6-10
<u>8.6</u>	11-15
<u>25.1</u>	16 or over
<u>7.5</u>	No response

¹The percent of responses that fell in each category is given in the blanks to the left of the alternative. Percentages are based on a total of 187 respondents from the 50 programs.

6. Please indicate your years of teaching at other levels than college or university.

(a) Elementary

10.2	1-2
10.8	3-5
10.2	6-10
2.1	11-15
3.2	16 or over
63.1	None
.5	No response

(b) Secondary

14.4	1-2
18.7	3-5
12.8	6-10
3.7	11-15
1.1	16 or over
48.7	None
.5	No response

(c) Junior College

3.7	1-2
3.2	3-5
1.6	6-10
.0	11-15
.0	16 or over
90.9	None
.5	No response

(d) Other (Please explain) _____

7. Please list colleges or universities from which you received degrees

A.B. _____
M.A. _____
Doctoral Degree _____

7a. If the opportunity presents itself, do you expect to go into full-time educational administration some day?

3.7	Definitely yes
7.5	Probably yes
7.5	Uncertain
39.6	Probably no
41.2	Definitely no
.5	No response

8. Have you taught previously in NDEA or NSF academic year or summer institutes?

34.8	Yes
64.7	No
.5	No response

Please explain _____

9. If yes, how did your experience in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program compare with your experience in a summer or academic year institute?

9.6	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was superior
7.5	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was somewhat better
11.8	About the same
3.2	Institute was somewhat better
2.7	Institute was superior
12.8	Have not taught in Institute previously
52.4	No response

10. Please list your father's primary occupation during his working years.

11. Please indicate with as much accuracy as possible, when you first decided to become a college teacher.

9.6	High school
6.4	First two years of college
21.9	Last two years of college
27.3	Early graduate school years
11.2	Late graduate school years
10.7	After graduate school
9.6	Never really decided, just "drifted" into college teaching
3.2	No response

12. Please check the education level of your parents

	Mother	Father
Less than eighth grade	11.8	16.6
Eighth grade	14.4	16.0
Some high school	12.3	9.1
High school graduate	24.1	15.0
Technical, business school graduate	7.5	5.3
Some college	12.8	7.0
College graduate	9.1	12.8
Some graduate and professional work	3.2	5.3
Received advanced degrees (specify) _____	1.6	10.2
No response	3.2	2.7

13. Please list two or three of the chief satisfactions that you experience in college teaching

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

14. Please list two or three of the main dissatisfactions you experience as a college teacher

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

15. If you could choose, at which of the following type of institutions would you prefer to teach?

1.1	Junior college
7.5	Private, undergraduate college
5.9	Public, undergraduate college
25.7	Private university
51.9	Public university
4.3	Other (please specify) _____
3.7	No response

16. Which of the following alternatives best describes your reaction to the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

42.2	It was a stimulating and interesting experience throughout
45.5	It was usually stimulating and interesting
8.0	It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting
1.1	It was seldom or never stimulating or interesting
3.2	No response

17. Did you feel that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program resulted in the participants becoming better scholars?

76.5	Yes
4.8	No
16.0	Uncertain
2.7	No response

Comments: _____

18. Did you feel that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program resulted in the participants becoming better teachers?

72.2	Yes
.5	No
23.5	Uncertain
3.7	No response

Comments: _____

19. What was the attitude of your institution toward the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

52.4	Strong interest and support
34.8	Cooperative
4.3	Tolerated it
1.1	Lack of support or interest
2.7	No acquaintance with it
4.8	No response

20. In your opinion how valuable was the overall program for

(a) Participants

52.4	Very valuable
40.1	Valuable
3.7	Undecided
.5	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all
3.2	No response

(b) Faculty

28.9	Very valuable
47.1	Valuable
13.4	Undecided
4.8	Not very valuable
1.1	Not valuable at all
4.8	No response

(c) Institution

31.0	Very valuable
39.0	Valuable
19.8	Undecided
4.8	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all
5.3	No response

(d) Upgrading high school teaching

27.8	Very valuable
33.2	Valuable
19.3	Undecided
2.7	Not very valuable
1.6	Not valuable at all
15.5	No response

21. Were there ways developed in the program whereby the participants could gain teaching experience and develop teaching skills?

65.2	Yes
11.2	No
17.6	Unsure
5.9	No response

Please explain _____

22. How did the students in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program compare to regular graduate students in your institution in the following areas?

(a) Intellectual ability

4.3	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
19.8	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
45.5	About the same as regular graduate students
22.5	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
5.3	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
2.5	No response

(b) Industriousness

20.3	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
40.1	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
33.2	About the same as regular graduate students
2.1	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.3	No response

(c) Seriousness of purpose

25.1	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
41.2	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
26.7	About the same as regular graduate students
2.7	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.3	No response

(d) Commitment to the discipline

18.2	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
27.3	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
34.2	About the same as regular graduate students
12.3	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
1.6	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
6.4	No response

(e) Knowledge of discipline

9.1	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
16.0	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
38.5	About the same as regular graduate students
16.6	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
13.9	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
5.9	No response

(f) Ability to communicate

7.5	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
32.1	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
44.9	About the same as regular graduate students
9.6	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
2.7	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
3.2	No response

(g) Initiative

17.6	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
34.8	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
39.6	About the same as regular graduate students
4.3	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
0.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
3.7	No response

23. Listed below are resource materials in educational media. Please check those that you used, and those you found useful as part of the teaching program of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

	Used	Useful
Instructional films	_____	_____
Documentary films	_____	_____
Tapes	_____	_____
Recordings	_____	_____
Opaque projectors	_____	_____
Overhead projectors	_____	_____
Filmstrips	_____	_____
Programmed instruction	_____	_____
Video tape recorders	_____	_____
Other (please list) _____	_____	_____

24. Did you find teaching in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program a challenging experience?

47.1	Extremely challenging
41.7	Somewhat challenging
5.3	Not very challenging
.0	Not at all challenging
5.9	No response

25. Did you find teaching in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program a satisfying experience?

51.3	Extremely satisfying
39.6	Somewhat satisfying
3.2	Not very satisfying
.5	Not at all satisfying
5.3	No response

26. In your opinion, were the educational needs of the participants met by the Program

42.2	Definitely
49.2	Probably
3.7	I doubt it
.0	Not at all
4.8	No response

27. Have you used, developed or observed any innovative teaching methods or practices in your work with Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

42.2	Yes
39.0	No
11.8	Unsure
7.0	No response

Please identify _____

28. As you reflect upon the year spent in teaching students in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your professional growth and development?

13.9	Very greatly
27.3	Greatly
34.8	Moderately
13.9	Little
5.3	Very little
4.8	No response

29. As you look back upon the year spent in Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your intellectual growth?

10.7	Very greatly
18.7	Greatly
39.6	Moderately
17.6	Little
7.0	Very little
6.4	No response

30. As you look back upon the year spent in Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your skill as a teacher?

9.6	Very greatly
19.3	Greatly
41.7	Moderately
18.7	Little
4.3	Very little
6.4	No response

31. Would you list below the single element of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program that was most impressive, innovative, or exciting. _____

32. Would you list below the single element of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program that was most discouraging, depressing, or ineffective. _____

33. How closely did the content and emphasis of the Program coincide with your expectations?

33.7	Very closely
46.0	Moderately closely
7.5	Not too closely
.5	Not at all
12.3	No response

Please explain _____

34. If you were to begin again, what specific changes would you suggest?

35. Did the students work hard during the year?

15.0	Yes, too hard
78.6	Yes
1.1	No
2.7	Uncertain
2.7	No response

Please comment on your answer _____

36. How closely do you feel the participants selected for your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program fit in with the type and objectives of your Institution?

35.8	Very closely
46.0	A few exceptions
8.0	A number of exceptions
1.1	Hardly fit at all
9.1	No response

37. Did your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program staff conduct regular staff meetings or discussions as the year progressed?

47.6	Yes
43.3	No
9.1	No response

38. How did you find your teaching assignment?

4.3	Unbelievably heavy
21.9	Quite heavy
58.8	About right
7.5	Quite light
1.1	Very light
6.4	No response

Please describe your assignment (classroom hours, etc.) _____

39. Were there outside lecturers or speakers invited to participate in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

74.3	Yes
19.3	No
6.4	No response

If yes, were they effective?

32.1	Very effective
29.9	Somewhat effective
3.2	Not very effective
.0	Not effective at all
34.8	No response

40. Were there significant adjustments in the program after the academic year began?

2.7	There were major revisions and adjustments
14.4	There were significant revisions and adjustments
44.4	There were slight revisions and adjustments
21.9	There were essentially no revisions or adjustments
16.6	No response

Please describe briefly the changes or adjustments _____

41. In your opinion, has the fact that Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program participants studied and worked as a group resulted in more satisfactory results?

51.9	Yes, use of group resulted in greatly enhanced learning
36.9	Perhaps, group effect was noticeable
2.7	Doubtful, group effect was not very useful in enhancing learning
1.1	No, group effect did not contribute to learning
7.5	No response

42. Did you as a teacher feel challenged by the group of Experienced Teacher Fellows?

25.7	Very much so challenged
50.8	Quite challenged
17.6	Not challenged very much
2.7	Not challenged at all
3.2	No response

Please comment _____

43. Did you feel threatened at all by the group of Experienced Teacher Fellows?

.0	Very much threatened
3.2	Quite threatened
11.8	Not threatened very much
81.3	Not threatened at all
3.7	No response

Please comment _____

44. Has the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program in which you have participated been imaginative and innovative?

15.0	Unusually imaginative and innovative
46.5	Quite imaginative and innovative
24.6	Not very imaginative and innovative
2.7	Not at all imaginative and innovative
11.2	No response

Please describe what you believe to be the most imaginative or innovative aspects of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program _____

45. Was an effort made to utilize the experience and background of the participants to enhance the learning and develop the Program?

65.8 Yes
 5.9 No
 23.0 Uncertain
 5.3 No response

Please comment _____

46. Was any effort made by the staff to modify the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program to take advantage of the experience and background of the participants?

35.8 Yes
 15.5 No
 40.1 Uncertain
 8.6 No response

Please describe any modification _____

47. How adequate were the several aspects of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Was Not Available	No Response
(a) Library	36.4	37.4	13.9	3.7	8.6	.0
(b) Classrooms	33.7	39.0	16.0	4.3	7.0	.0
(c) Educational media	22.5	42.2	12.8	1.1	20.9	.5
(d) Field trips	15.5	27.3	7.5	3.2	46.0	.5
(e) Staff meetings	18.2	21.9	16.0	9.1	34.8	.0
(f) Graduate assistant help	14.4	16.6	12.3	1.1	55.1	.5

48. Was there a feeling of group solidarity among participants in the Program?

52.9 Yes, there was a strong feeling of group solidarity
 38.0 There was considerable feeling of group solidarity
 4.8 There was some, but not much, feeling of solidarity
 .5 There was no feeling of solidarity at all
 3.7 No response

49. How would you rate the overall morale of the participants?

27.8 Very high
 50.8 Pretty high
 13.9 About average
 2.7 Pretty low
 .5 Very low
 4.3 No response

50. Did the participants seem genuinely interested in the subject matter of the Program?

53.5	Definitely yes
42.2	For the most part, yes
1.1	For the most part, no
.0	Almost completely no
3.2	No response

51. How well do you think the participants understood the objectives and purposes of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program before the year began?

21.4	Very well
33.7	Pretty well
17.1	Well enough
13.9	Not very well
3.2	Not well at all
.5	Were not aware of any objectives or purposes
10.2	No response

How were these purposes and objectives communicated to them?

GENERAL COMMENTS

Only a few aspects of your experience as an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program staff member can be examined in a questionnaire of this sort. Therefore, in the space below we welcome your individual comments on the Program and its effects upon you and your colleagues.

Appendix D. Responses to Directors Questionnaire¹

1. How old were you as of your last birthday?

.0	20-29 years
24.4	30-39 years
44.4	40-49 years
22.2	50-59 years
8.9	60 and over

2. Your sex

84.4	Male
11.1	Female
4.4	No response

3. Please check your last earned degree

.0	A.B.
6.7	M.A.
55.6	Ph.D.
37.8	Ed.D.
.0	D. Sci
.0	Other (please list) _____

4. Please list field of specialization in undergraduate and graduate school, and any post-doctoral training you have had.

Undergraduate _____
 Graduate _____
 Post Doctoral _____

5. How many years have you taught full time at the college level?

.0	1-2
20.0	3-5
26.7	6-10
15.6	11-15
35.6	16 and over
2.2	No response

¹The percent of responses that fell in each category is given in the blanks to the left of the alternatives. Percentages are based on a total of 45 respondents.

6. Please indicate your years of teaching at other levels than college or university.

(a) Elementary

20.0	1-2
17.8	3-5
13.3	6-10
.0	11-15
2.2	16 or over
28.9	None
17.8	No response

(b) Secondary

33.3	1-2
24.4	3-5
6.7	6-10
4.4	11-15
4.4	16 or over
17.8	None
8.9	No response

(c) Junior College

2.2	1-2
.0	3-5
.0	6-10
.0	11-15
.0	16 or over
37.8	None
60.0	No response

(d) Other (please explain) _____

7. Please list colleges or universities from which you received degrees

A.B. _____

M.A. _____

Doctoral Degree _____

7a. If the opportunity presents itself, do you expect to go into full-time educational administration some day?

8.8	Definitely yes
13.3	Probably yes
13.3	Uncertain
33.3	Probably no
26.7	Definitely no
4.4	No response

8. Have you taught previously in NDEA or NSF academic year or summer institutes?

48.9 Yes
51.1 No

Please explain _____

9. If yes, how did your experience in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program compare with your experience in a summer or academic year institute?

24.4 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was superior
8.9 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was somewhat better
8.9 About the same
2.2 Institute was somewhat better
2.2 Institute was superior
53.3 No response

10. Please indicate your father's primary occupation during his working years.

11. Please indicate, with as much accuracy as possible, when you first decided to become a college teacher.

4.4 High school
2.2 First two years of college
13.3 Last two years of college
53.3 Early graduate school years
17.8 Late graduate school years
0.0 After graduate school
6.7 Never really decided, just "drifted" into college teaching
2.2 No response

12. Please check the education level of your parents

	Mother	Father
Less than eighth grade	11.1	24.4
Eighth grade	22.2	22.2
Some high school	20.0	13.3
High school graduate	28.9	15.6
Technical, business school graduate	2.2	6.7
College graduate	11.1	8.9
Some graduate and professional work	2.2	.0
Received advanced degrees (specify) _____	2.2	4.4
No response	.0	4.4

13. Please list two or three of the chief satisfactions that you experience in college teaching.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

14. Please list two or three of the main dissatisfactions that you experience as a college teacher.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

15. If you could choose, at which of the following type of institutions would you prefer to teach?

.0	Junior college
2.2	Private, undergraduate college
2.2	Public, undergraduate college
60.0	Public University
28.9	Private University
2.2	Other (please specify) _____
4.4	No response

16. Which of the following alternatives best describe your reaction to the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

60.0	It was a stimulating and interesting experience throughout
37.8	It was usually stimulating and interesting
2.2	It was only occasionally stimulating and interesting
0.0	It was seldom or never stimulating or interesting
.0	No response

17. Did you feel that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program resulted in the participants becoming better scholars?

97.8	Yes
.0	No
2.2	Uncertain

Comments _____

18. Did you feel that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program resulted in the participants becoming better teachers?

80.0	Yes
.0	No
13.3	Uncertain
6.7	No response

Comments _____

19. What was the attitude of your institution toward the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

62.2	Strong interest and support
31.1	Cooperative
4.4	Tolerated it
.0	Lack of support or interest
2.2	No acquaintance with it

20. In your opinion how valuable was the overall program for

(a) Participants

75.6	Very valuable
24.4	Valuable
.0	Undecided
.0	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all

(b) Faculty

42.2	Very valuable
44.4	Valuable
8.9	Undecided
2.2	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all
2.2	No response

(c) Institution

48.9	Very valuable
44.4	Valuable
2.2	Undecided
4.4	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all

(c) Seriousness of purpose

28.9	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
37.8	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
28.9	About the same as regular graduate students
.0	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

(d) Commitment to the discipline

31.1	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
35.6	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
20.0	About the same as regular graduate students
8.9	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

(e) Knowledge of discipline

8.9	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
26.7	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
37.8	About the same as regular graduate students
13.3	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
8.9	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

(f) Ability to communicate

6.7	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
35.6	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
44.4	About the same as regular graduate students
8.9	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

(g) Initiative

22.2	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
42.2	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
26.7	About the same as regular graduate students
4.4	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

(d) Upgrading public school teaching

60.0	Very valuable
31.1	Valuable
4.4	Undecided
.0	Not very valuable
.0	Not valuable at all
4.4	No response

21. Were there ways developed in the program whereby the participants could gain teaching experience and develop teaching skills?

71.1	Yes
22.2	No
4.4	Unsure
2.2	No response

Please explain _____

22. How did the students in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program compare to regular graduate students in your institution in the following areas?

(a) Intellectual ability

8.9	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
20.0	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
55.6	About the same as regular graduate students
11.1	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
2.2	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
2.2	No response

(b) Industriousness

26.7	Decidedly superior to regular graduate students
37.8	Somewhat better than regular graduate students
31.1	About the same as regular graduate students
.0	Somewhat less capable than regular graduate students
.0	Decidedly inferior to our regular graduate students
4.4	No response

23. Listed below are resource materials in educational media. Please check those that you used, and those you found useful as part of the teaching program of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

	Used	Useful
Instructional films	---	---
Documentary films	---	---
Tapes	---	---
Recordings	---	---
Opaque projectors	---	---
Overhead projectors	---	---
Filmstrips	---	---
Programmed instruction	---	---
Video tape recorders	---	---
Others (please list) _____	---	---

24. Did you find teaching in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program a challenging experience?

64.4 _____ Extremely challenging
 31.1 _____ Somewhat challenging
 .0 _____ Not very challenging
 .0 _____ Not at all challenging
 4.4 _____ No response

25. Did you find teaching in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program a satisfying experience?

71.1 _____ Extremely satisfying
 24.4 _____ Somewhat satisfying
 .0 _____ Not very satisfying
 .0 _____ Not at all satisfying
 4.4 _____ No response

26. In your opinion, were the educational needs of the participants met by the Program?

66.7 _____ Definitely
 31.1 _____ Probably
 2.2 _____ I doubt it
 .0 _____ Not at all

27. Have you used, developed or observed any innovative teaching methods or practices in your work with Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

71.1 _____ Yes
 8.9 _____ No
 13.3 _____ Unsure
 6.7 _____ No response

Please identify _____

30

28. As you reflect upon the year spent in teaching students in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your professional growth and development?

17.8	Very greatly
35.6	Greatly
42.2	Moderately
2.2	Little
.0	Very little
2.2	No response

29. As you look back upon the year spent in Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your intellectual growth?

8.9	Very greatly
28.9	Greatly
55.6	Moderately
4.4	Little
.0	Very little
2.2	No response

30. As you look back upon the year spent in Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, how much do you feel it added to your skill as a teacher?

8.9	Very greatly
24.4	Greatly
53.3	Moderately
4.4	Little
4.4	Very little
4.4	No response

31. Would you list below the single element of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program that was most impressive, innovative, or exciting.

32. Would you list below the single element of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program that was most discouraging, depressing, or ineffective.

33. How closely did the content and emphasis of the Program coincide with your expectations?

57.8	Very closely
40.0	Moderately closely
2.2	Not too closely
.0	Not at all

Please explain _____

34. If you were to begin again, what specific changes would you suggest?

35. Did the students work hard during the year?

13.3	Yes, too hard
84.4	Yes
2.2	No
.0	Uncertain

Please comment on your answer _____

36. How closely do you feel the participants selected for your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program fit in with the type and objectives of your Institution?

44.4	Very closely
53.3	A few exceptions
2.2	A number of exceptions
.0	Hardly fit at all

37. Did your Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program staff conduct regular staff meetings or discussions as the year progressed?

75.6	Yes
20.0	No
4.4	No response

38. How did you find your teaching assignment?

4.4	Unbelievably heavy
40.0	Quite heavy
42.2	About right
4.4	Quite light
.0	Very light
8.9	No response

Please describe your assignment (classroom hours, etc.) _____

39. Were there outside lecturers or speakers invited to participate in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

88.9	Yes
8.9	No
2.2	No response

If yes, were they effective?

57.8	Very effective
31.1	Somewhat effective
.0	Not very effective
2.2	Not effective at all
8.9	No response

40. Were there significant adjustments in the program after the academic year began?

2.2	There were major revisions and adjustments
28.9	There were significant revisions and adjustments
51.1	There were slight revisions and adjustments
17.8	There were essentially no revisions or adjustments

Please describe briefly the changes or adjustments _____

41. In your opinion, has the fact that Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program participants studied and worked as a group resulted in more satisfactory results?

77.8	Yes, use of group resulted in greatly enhanced learning
20.0	Perhaps, group effect was noticeable
2.2	Doubtful, group effect was not very useful in enhancing learning
.0	No, group effect did not contribute to learning

42. Did you as a teacher feel challenged by the group of Experienced Teacher Fellows?

33.3	Very much so challenged
55.6	Quite challenged
4.4	Not challenged very much
.0	Not challenged at all
6.7	No response

Please comment _____

43. Did you feel threatened at all by the group of Experienced Teacher Fellows?

.0	Very much threatened
.0	Quite threatened
15.6	Not threatened very much
82.2	Not threatened at all
2.2	No response

Please comment _____

44. Has the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program in which you have participated been imaginative and innovative?

22.2	Unusually imaginative and innovative
62.2	Quite imaginative and innovative
11.1	Not very imaginative and innovative
.0	Not at all imaginative and innovative
4.4	No response

Please describe what you believe to be the most imaginative or innovative aspects of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program _____

45. Was an effort made to utilize the experience and background of the participants to enhance the learning and develop the program?

88.9	Yes
4.4	No
6.7	Uncertain

Please comment _____

46. Was any effort made by the staff to modify the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program to take advantage of the experience and background of the participants?

62.2 Yes
 26.7 No
 8.9 Uncertain
 2.2 No response

Please describe any modification _____

47. How adequate were the several aspects of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Was Not Available	No Response
(a) Library	60.0	24.4	13.3	2.2	.0	.0
(b) Classrooms	40.0	40.0	17.8	2.2	.0	.0
(c) Educational media	31.1	53.3	13.3	.0	.0	2.2
(d) Field trips	31.1	28.9	11.1	8.9	13.3	6.7
(e) Staff meetings	20.0	42.2	20.0	4.4	13.3	.0
(f) Graduate assistant help	17.8	35.6	2.2	2.2	40.0	3.2

48. Was there a feeling of group solidarity among participants in the Program?

66.7 Yes, there was a strong feeling of group solidarity
 26.7 There was considerable feeling of group solidarity
 6.7 There was some, but not much, feeling of solidarity
 .0 There was no feeling of solidarity at all

49. How would you rate the overall morale of the participants?

37.8 Very high
 42.2 Pretty high
 17.8 About average
 2.2 Pretty low
 .0 Very low

50. Did the participants seem genuinely interested in the subject matter of the Program?

60.0	Definitely yes
40.0	For the most part, yes
.0	For the most part, no
.0	Almost completely no

51. How well do you think the participants understood the objectives and purposes of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program before the year began?

20.0	Very well
64.4	Pretty well
15.6	Not very well
.0	Not well at all
.0	Was not aware of any objectives or purposes

How were these purposes and objectives communicated to them?

52. How would you describe the cooperation that you received from other academic departments of the University?

40.0	Unusually good
51.1	Quite good
4.4	Quite poor
2.2	Unusually poor
2.2	No response

53. Is the director of the teacher-education on your campus aware of the operation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program on your campus?

28.9	Very much involved
22.2	Quite involved
44.4	Not very involved
2.2	Not at all involved
2.2	No response

54. Is he involved in the operation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program on your campus?

8.9	Very much involved
17.8	Quite involved
51.1	Not very involved
20.0	Not involved at all
2.2	No response

55. In your opinion, has the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program had an impact on the on-going teacher education program in your institution?

24.4	A very great impact
37.8	Some impact
13.3	Uncertain
15.6	Little impact
6.7	Practically no impact at all
2.2	No response

Please describe briefly the impact _____

56. Please describe as carefully, but briefly, as you can the nature and extension of the relationship between the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program and the cooperating school systems. (Include such items as selection, supervision, integration of seminars, development of programs and courses.) _____

57. Did you, in addition to your duties as director, teach courses in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

77.8	Yes
17.8	No
4.4	No response

Please describe _____

58. Did you have a difficult time recruiting staff members for the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?

11.1 Yes
88.9 No

If yes, would you comment _____

59. Please give the number of students who began the program but did not finish.

Please comment on the students who dropped out. _____

GENERAL COMMENTS

Only a few aspects of your experience as director of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program can be examined in a questionnaire of this sort. Therefore, in the space below we welcome your individual comments on the Program and its effects.

Appendix E. Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program Evaluation Teams¹

MATH AND SCIENCE

Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana

- SA - *Harold K. Hughes, Chairman, Department of Physics
Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana 47809
- TE - Ralph Lefler, Department of Physics
Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana 47906
- MT - Robert N. White, Science Department Head
Clarksville Jr. High School, Clarksville, Indiana 47131

Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida

- SA - *Houston T. Karnes, Math Dept., Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
- TE - William McKillip, Professor of Math Education, 121B Baldwin Hall
College of Education, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601
- MT - Mrs. Agnes Rickey, Supervisor of Mathematics
County Board of Public Instruction, Miami, Florida

Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

- SA - Richard E. Hodges, Director, Elementary Teacher Education Program
Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago
5835 S. Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
- TE - *William Eller, School of Education, State University
Buffalo, New York 14214
- MT - Margaret Wittrig, Board of Education, Primary Consultant
346 Second Avenue, S. W., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404

¹The following abbreviations are used to identify the professional roles of team members:

- SA - Subject Area Specialist
- TE - Teacher Education Specialist
- MT - Master Teacher or other Supervisory Person
- * - Team Coordinator

HISTORY

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

- SA - *John M. Thompson, Department of History
University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana
- TE - Howard Reinstra, Department of History
Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506
- MT - Zeb Wright, Program Specialist, Social Studies
West Virginia State Dept. of Education, State Capital Building
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois

- SA - *Gilbert Fite, Department of History
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma
- TE - Howard Reinstra (as listed above under Carnegie Tech.)
- MT - Gary Baker, Committee on the Study of History
Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

- SA - *W. Burlie Brown, Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana
- TE - Richard Brown, Chairman, Committee on the Study of History
Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois
- MT - James Landing, Instructor in Geography, Elston Jr/Sr High School
Detroit at Spring Street, Michigan City, Indiana 46360

SOCIAL STUDIES

Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York

- SA - *Saul B. Cohen, Director, Graduate School of Geography
Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
- TE - Isador Starr, History Department, City University of New York
Queens College, Kissena Plvd., Flushing, New York 11367
- MT - Philip Woodruff, Westport Public Schools, Westport, Connecticut

ENGLISH

University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

- SA - *Norman C. Stageberg, Professor of English
Iowa State College, Cedar Falls, Iowa
- TE - Dean William Jenkins, School of Education
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- MT - Mrs. Esther Williams, Chairman, English Department
Wilmington High School, 300 Richardson Place, Wilmington, Ohio 45177

University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska

- SA - Richard Braddock, Coordinator, Rhetoric Program
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240
- TE - *Norman C. Stageberg (as listed above under U. of Illinois)
- MT - Mrs. Esther Williams (as listed above under U. of Illinois)

READING

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

- SA - Nathan Blount, Research and Development Center
1404 Regent Street, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
- TE - *Naomi Chase, Assoc. Professor of Education, Elementary Department
Burton Hall, School of Education, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
- MT - Mary Huber, Reading Teacher, Terre Haute Public Schools
1101 S. 13th Street, Terre Haute, Indiana

Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California

- SA - *Carl Miller, Associate Professor of Education, Bakersfield Center
of Fresno State College, 4021 Mt. Vernon Avenue, Bakersfield, California 93306
- TE - Jordan B. Utsey, Associate Professor of Education, School of Education
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 94703
- MT - Millard Black, Curriculum Consultant, Los Angeles City Schools
450 Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California

TEACHING OF THE DISADVANTAGED

University of Alaska, College, Alaska

- SA - Richard P. Longaker, Department of Political Science
University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024
- TE - *Matt Trippe, School of Education, University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
- MT - Gretta Pruitt, Principal, Garfield Public School
Pasadena School System, Pasadena, California

Illinois Teachers College, Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

- SA - *Matt Trippe (see above under U. of Alaska)
- TE - E. Boyd Shannon (Pasadena College) (Temp.: 1250 Fourth Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C.)
- MT - Marjorie Mayo, Principal, Abraham Lincoln School
Kankakee, Illinois 60901

Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

- SA - *Walter Crockett, Department of Psychology
Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
- TE - Roy Edelfelt, Associate Secretary, National Committee on Teacher
Education and Professional Standards, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
- MT - Mrs. Jean Kunz, Director of Nursery School/Kindergarten, College of Education
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742

Texas Western College, El Paso, Texas

- SA - *Jacques Wilson, Our Lady of the Lake College, 411 S. W. 24th Street,
San Antonio, Texas 78207
- TE - Joseph Cardenas, St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas 78228
- MT - Mrs. Herlinda Garcia, Edinburg Public Schools, Edinburg, Texas

Richard Gordon, School of Education
Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts 01610

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

SA - Frederick J. Gaudet, Director, Laboratory of Psychological Studies
Stevens Institute, Hoboken, New Jersey

TE - *Joseph Young, School of Education, Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

MT - Irving Zweibelson, Senior Psychologist
City School District, New Rochelle, New York 10810

University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

SA - *Marle Ohlsen, Professor, Educational Psychology, 188 Education Building
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

TE - Donald L. Molder, Ph.D., Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois

MT - W. David Whiteside, Director Pupil Services, Arlington Heights Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

University of Rochester, Rochester, New York

SA - *Buford Stefflre, Professor of Education
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

TE - Goldie Ruth Koback, Professor of Education, City College of New York
Convent Avenue at 135th Street, New York, New York 10031

MT - George Leute, Guidance Counselor, Haverford Township Sr. High School
Haverton, Pennsylvania 19083

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee

SA - Twiley W. Barker, Department of Political Science, University of Illinois -
Chicago Circle, P. O. Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680

TE - *Dean Jerome Sachs, Illinois Teachers College
Chicago-North, Chicago, Illinois

MT - Lewis J. Hilliard, Principal, Edison School
521 E. Perkins Avenue, Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62468

University of Missouri, Kansas City, Missouri

SA - Twiley W. Barker (see above under Fisk University)

TE - *Dean Jerome Sachs (see above under Fisk University)

MT - Lewis J. Hilliard (see above under Fisk University)

Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

SA - Edward Bantel, School of Education, Psychology Department
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

TE - *Roy Edelfelt (see above under Temple University)

MT - Mrs. Jean Kunz (see above under Temple University)

MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana

SA - *Norman P. Sacks, Professor, Spanish and Portuguese
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

TE - Miss Marianne Ciotti, Candidate for Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education
1634 Neil Avenue, Room 433, Neil Hall, Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

MT - Anthony Gradisnik, Milwaukee Public Schools
5225 W. Vliet Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53208

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

SA - F. W. Strothman, Professor of German, Executive Head, Department of
Modern European Languages, Stanford University, Stanford, California

TE - *Joseph E. Axelrod, Coordinator Experimental Freshman Year Program
San Francisco State College, 540 Powell Street
San Francisco, California 94108

MT - Helen Shelton, Supervisor Foreign Language Program, P. O. Box 527
State Office of Professional Instruction, Olympia, Washington 98501

ART AND MUSIC

Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona

SA - Ronald Silverman, Professor of Art Education, California State College
5151 State College, Los Angeles, California 90032

TE - *William Engbretson, School of Education, University of Denver
Denver, Colorado 80210

MT - Mrs. Audrey Welch, Supervisor of Art, Glendale Unified School System
411 East Wilson Avenue, Glendale, California 91206

GEOGRAPHY

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

SA - *Edwin N. Thomas, Research Director, Transportation Center
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

TE - Jewell Phelps, Professor of Geography
George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee 37203

MT - James Landing (see details under University of Kansas)

Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oregon

SA - *George H. Kakuichi, Department of Geography, University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

TE - William Jones, Division of Education, California State College at Hayward
25800 Hillary Street, Hayward, California 94542

MT - Charles Moody, Consultant in Social Science, and Executive Secretary SSSSC
and Coordinator of Fine Arts and Humanities Project, State Department of
Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814

EDUCATIONAL MEDIA

Chapman College, Orange, California

SA - *James W. Brown, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, San Jose
State College, San Jose, California

(Observer - Richard P. Longaker)

TE - Vernon S. Gerlach, Associate Professor, Classroom Learning Laboratory
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281

MT - Robert Gerletti, Director, Division of Educational Media, Los Angeles
County Schools, 155 W. Washington Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90015

SCHOOL LIBRARY

Columbia University, New York, New York

SA - Paul Masoner, Dean and Professor of Education, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

TE - *Sara Fenwick, Graduate Library School
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

MT - Mrs. Nancy Walker, Supervisor, Library Services, Anne Arundel County Schools

HEALTH EDUCATION

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

SA - Willis J. Baughman, Professor of Health Education, University of Alabama
University, Alabama

TE - *J. W. Kistler, Head, Department Health and Physical Education
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

MT - Michael Flanagan, Director, Health and Physical Education, Pennsylvania
State Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY

Rutgers - The State University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

SA - Frederick J. Gaudet)

TE - *Joseph Young) See details under University of Maryland

MT - Irving Zweibelson)

ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATION

University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana

SA - *David Beggs, School of Education, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Indiana

TE - William McKillip (see details under Florida State University)

MT - Mrs. Agnes Rickey (see details under Florida State University)

Appendix F. Responses to Visitors Evaluation Form¹

1. Is the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program having an impact on the on-going teacher education program of the institution?

<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
No						Very
Impact						Impressive
						Impact

General comments: Is there evidence that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is strengthening teacher education? How did you gather your information? Can you be specific?

2. All programs, in their proposals, maintained that imagination and innovation would be important aspects of their programs. Is there such imagination and innovation in action?

<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
No imagination						Great deal of
or innovation						imagination
						and innovation

General comments: What are the imaginative and innovative elements? Who was responsible for them? Are they working? Are they operational and reproducible? What is the single most innovative aspect of the program? What is the least innovative?

3. Are subject matter and teacher education departments working together?

<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Not at						Very close
all						cooperation

General comments: How are the subject matter and education departments cooperating? In program development, seminar programs, course development, etc.? Is the program truly integrated? Should it be?

¹ Numbers in the blanks indicate the number of evaluation teams who checked each alternative. In the actual version of this form, each question was on a different page in order to leave space for extensive comments.

4. All of the programs indicate cooperation with local and other school districts. How extensive are the relationships between colleges (and universities) and cooperating school districts?

5 5 5 5 3 6 2
 No relationship Very productive relationship

General comments: What is the nature of the cooperation? What seems to be the reason for lack of cooperation? Is there supervision of teachers? Integration of seminars, joint programs?

5. Did the institution receive a grant under the Institutional Grants Program?

22 Yes 9 No

Please discuss any information you have that such funds were used to improve and strengthen the normal ongoing teacher training program.

6. How adequate were the institution's facilities to the scope and purposes of the Program?¹

7 3 7 8 3 2 0
 Altogether adequate Clearly inadequate

General comments: Were the classrooms, library, educational media, and other facilities adequate to the Program?

7. Sometimes a program in operation operates substantially as it was envisioned in the proposal, sometimes there are major deviations from the proposal. To what extent did this Program conform to the outlines of the proposal?

6 10 8 5 2 0 0
 Almost exactly Extreme deviation

General comments: Were the deviations, such as they were, sensible and beneficial or harmful and ill-considered? Or should there have been greater flexibility in the Program.

¹One evaluation teams did not respond to this item.

8. To what extent did the Program appear to contribute to the plans for development of the Department and the Institution?

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
Hardly at all						Great deal

General comments: How, specifically, does this program fit into the long-range plans for developing the Department?

9. Have the director or the staff of the program been challenged by the Program? (this could be interpreted either as "stimulated" or "threatened" or both -- Please indicate the difference below.)

<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>6</u>
Stimulated not at all						Yes definitely
<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Threatened very much						Not at all

General comments: Would you say that the faculty members have grown professionally during the year? Or has it been a year of treading water? Is there any evidence that the staff has been threatened by the students or resentful of them?

10. Does their participation in the Program seem to have drawn the faculty together as a group or to produce dissension and division among them?

<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Drew them together						Produced division

General comments: In what respects have the staff been drawn together? In what respects have they been divided?

11. On the average how well qualified were the staff members who taught in the Program?

<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Highly qualified						Substantially unqualified

12. How much variation in quality of the staff was there around this average value?

<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Little						Great
variation						variation

General comments: Feel free to comment at some length on the qualifications of the staff.

13. Was the faculty's load too light, too heavy, or about right? (Note that this scale ranges from too light to too heavy.)

<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
Too light			About			Too heavy
			right			

General comments:

14. How about the work load of the participants?

<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
Too light			About			Too heavy
			right			

General comments:

15. How effectively was the initial process of selecting participants carried out?

<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Extremely						Generally
effective						ineffective

General comments: How carefully was the selection procedure carried out? Was there an attempt to find participants who would be uniquely suited to the Program? If so, was this attempt successful?

16. Has the Program taken account of and advantage of the rich experience and prior preparation of the experienced teachers?

<u>1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Not						Yes
at all						definitely

General comments: There is some information which indicates that several programs have not taken account of the experience of the participants. Is this the case? What are the clues to this judgment? Were there changes made to remedy the situation? What are the constructive features of the Program which capitalize upon the experience and preparation of the participants?

17. Unlike conventional graduate programs, the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program is based upon a block or group program approach. The intent is to use the group to enhance learning by building morale and esprit de corps. Has this been successful?

<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>
Not						Extremely
at all						successful

General comments: In your opinion, has the Program produced greater benefits for subject matter teaching competence than the conventional type of program? Has the group become widely separated from other graduate students? Has friction developed?

18. Were the relations of the participants to regular graduate students in the Department cordial or hostile?

<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Cordial						Hostile

General comments: At what points did the relations between participants and graduate students seem most strained? Least strained? Would you say that the strength or weakness of the over-all graduate program contributed to or detracted from the effectiveness of the Program?

¹Three evaluation teams did not reply to this item.

19. Did the Program seem to meet the needs of the participants?

<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Extremely well						Very poorly

General comments: In what respects were the staff and the Program most sensitive to the needs of the participants? In what ways did the Program's structure conflict with the needs of the participants?

20. How well do you think the general concepts of the subject matter were communicated to the participants?

<u>1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Well						Very poorly

General comments: Please indicate those aspects of the subject matter you feel were especially effective and those that seemed least adequately presented.

21. How appropriate was the content of the curriculum to the needs and abilities of the students?

<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Very appropriate						Quite Inappropriate

General comments: Was the level of content too high for participants? Too low? How much variability in level did there appear to be from time to time or from instructor to instructor?

22. Have the participants maintained contact with their home school systems this year?¹

<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Yes, close contact						Almost no contact

General comments: Have participants operated substantially independently of the schools they will return to, or have they retained contacts and feelings of membership in their home schools?

¹One team of evaluators did not reply to this item.

23. Will the participants be able to apply what they have learned when they return to their schools next year?

<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Definitely yes						Probably not

General comments: What do participants expect their supervisors to demand of them next year? Do they think they will be able to meet their demands? Do you think they can meet the demands?

24. Finally, please feel free to comment at length on the aspects of the Program that you have not presented above. What was your over-all judgment of the Program and its effectiveness?